CLEAN DEVELOPMENT MECHANISM

CDM-EB70-A36-PROC

Procedure

Development, revision and clarification of baseline and monitoring methodologies and methodological tools

Version 02.1

United Nations
Framework Convention on
Climate Change

TABLE OF CONTENTS **Page**

1. Introduction

1. One of the basic rules of the clean development mechanism (CDM) process established by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP) and the Executive Board of the CDM (hereinafter referred to as the Board) is that CDM project activities and programmes of activities (PoAs) have to apply a baseline and monitoring methodology approved by the Board. If a proposed CDM project activity or PoA intends to apply a new methodology, such methodology has to be approved by the Board prior to the submission of a request for registration of the project activity or PoA. Likewise, a revision of an approved methodology has to be approved by the Board prior to its application to a proposed CDM project activity or PoA. If the applicability of an approved methodology to a specific project activity or PoA is in doubt, a clarification may be sought from the Board.

2. Over the years, the Board has adopted a number of separate procedures for the approval of new methodologies, and for the revision and the clarification of approved methodologies and methodological tools, most of which deal with only "bottom-up" processes, that is, based on submissions of proposed new methodologies, proposed revised methodologies and methodological tools and clarification requests from stakeholders. Each procedure has been tailored to a specific type of CDM project activity (i.e. large-scale, small-scale, afforestation and reforestation, or carbon capture and storage) and for a specific purpose (i.e. approval of new methodologies, revision of approved methodologies or methodological tools, or clarification on the applicability of approved methodologies or methodological tools).

3. Recently, more and more methodologies and methodological tools have been developed and revised through a "top-down" process, meaning that the Board decides to develop a new methodology or methodological tool or revise an existing one, as prompted by the CMP, or as suggested by a methodological panel or working group or the UNFCCC secretariat (hereinafter referred to as the secretariat), in order to facilitate the development and revision of methodologies or methodological tools with wide applicability, enhanced environmental integrity, consistency and clarity, among other features. However, a documented procedure to govern the process of the development of "top-down" methodologies and methodological tools has been largely lacking.

2. Scope, applicability and entry into force

2.1. Scope

4. This procedure defines the processes for the development of new methodologies and methodological tools, for the revision of approved methodologies and methodological tools, and for the provision of clarifications of approved methodologies and methodological tools.

2.2. Applicability

5. This procedure applies to:

   (a) All "bottom-up"[1] cases for the development of new methodologies, and all "top-down"[2] cases for the development of new methodologies and methodological tools;

   (b) All "bottom-up" and "top-down" cases for the revision of approved methodologies and methodological tools;

   (c) All "bottom-up" and "top-down" cases for the provision of clarifications of approved methodologies and methodological tools.

6. This procedure does not apply to clarification requests on standards or guidelines on methodologies. Such requests shall be submitted and processed under the "Procedure: Direct communication with stakeholders".

2.3. Entry into force

7. Version 03.0 of this procedure shall be effective from 14 July 2017.

3. Normative references

8. The following referenced documents are indispensable for the application of this procedure:

   (a) "CDM project cycle procedure";

   (b) "Glossary of CDM terms".

4. Definitions

9. In addition to the definitions in the "Glossary of CDM terms", the following terms apply in this procedure:

   (a) "Shall" is used to indicate requirements to be followed;

   (b) "Should" is used to indicate that among several possibilities, one course of action is recommended as particularly suitable;

   (c) "May" is used to indicate what is permitted.

[1] In this document, "bottom-up" means that project participants of project activities, coordinating/managing entities of PoAs, designated operational entities (DOEs) or other stakeholders initiate the process by submitting a proposal or a request to the secretariat.

[2] In this document, "top-down" means that the Board, the relevant methodological panel or working group, or the secretariat initiates the process.

5. Development of new methodology or methodological tool

5.1. Bottom-up process

5.1.1. Submission of proposed new methodology

10. The secretariat shall publish the schedules of the meetings of the methodological panel and working groups (the Methodologies Panel, the Afforestation and Reforestation Working Group, and the Carbon Capture and Storage Working Group) and the deadlines for the submission of proposals of new methodologies to be considered by the relevant methodological panel or working group at the corresponding meetings. The relevant panel or working group shall make every effort to initiate the consideration of the proposal at the meeting, taking into account the priorities set by the chair of the panel or working group for that meeting.

11. The project participants of a planned CDM project activity, the coordinating/managing entity of a planned CDM PoA, a DOE, a designated national authority (DNA) or any other stakeholder (hereinafter in section 5.1 referred to as the proponent) may propose a new methodology to the Board by submitting, through a specific interface on the UNFCCC CDM website, the following documents to the secretariat:

    (a) The duly completed “New baseline and monitoring methodology proposal” form (CDM-PNM-FORM);

    (b) The proposed new methodology using the relevant form (CDM-NM-FORM, CDM-SSC-NM-FORM, CDM-AR-NM-FORM or CDM-CCS-NM-FORM);

    (c) The draft project design document (PDD) of the planned CDM project activity or the draft programme design document (PoA-DD) of the planned PoA that intends to apply the proposed new methodology, using the relevant PDD or PoA-DD form and with at least the following sections of the form and relevant appendices completed, applying the proposed new methodology:

        (i) For planned CDM project activities:

            a. Description of project activity;

            b. Application of selected approved baseline and monitoring methodology;

            c. Duration and crediting period;

        (ii) For planned CDM PoAs:

            a. General description of PoA;

            b. Demonstration of additionality and development of eligibility criteria;

            c. Duration of PoA;

            d. General description of a generic CPA;

            e. Application of a baseline and monitoring methodology.

5.1.2. Completeness check

12. The secretariat shall conduct a completeness check of the submission within seven days of the deadline for submissions referred to in paragraph 10 above.

13. If the secretariat finds that the submission is incomplete, it shall request the proponent to submit the missing or revised documents and/or information. In this case, the proponent shall submit the requested documents and/or information to the secretariat within five days of receipt of the request. If the proponent does not submit the requested documents and/or information by this deadline, the secretariat shall conclude that the submission is incomplete.

14. Upon conclusion of the completeness check, the secretariat shall notify the proponent of the conclusion of the completeness check. If the submission is concluded as incomplete in accordance with paragraph 13 above, the secretariat shall communicate the underlying reason(s) to the proponent. In this case, the proponent may resubmit the proposed new methodology with revised documentation at any time. Upon submission, the revised documentation shall be treated as a new submission of a proposed new methodology under this procedure.

5.1.3. Initial assessment

15. Upon positive conclusion of the completeness check, the secretariat shall conduct an initial assessment of the submission using the "New baseline and monitoring methodology initial assessment" form (CDM-PNIA-FORM) within 30 days of the deadline for submissions referred to in paragraph 10 above, to determine whether the submission qualifies for consideration by the relevant methodological panel or working group and the Board.

16. If, during the initial assessment, the secretariat identifies minor issues in the submission, it shall request the proponent to submit the missing or revised documents and/or information. In this case, the proponent shall submit the requested documents and/or information to the secretariat within five days of receipt of the request. If the proponent does not submit the requested documents and/or information by this deadline, the secretariat shall conclude that the submission is incomplete.

17. Upon conclusion of the initial assessment, the secretariat shall notify the proponent of the conclusion of the initial assessment. If the submission is concluded as unqualified for consideration, or incomplete in accordance with paragraph 16 above, the secretariat shall communicate the underlying reason(s) to the proponent. In this case, the proponent may resubmit the proposed new methodology with revised documentation at any time. Upon submission, the revised documentation shall be treated as a new submission of a proposed new methodology under this procedure.

18. If the submission is concluded as qualified for consideration, the secretariat shall issue a unique reference number to the proposed new methodology and make the submission publicly available on the UNFCCC CDM website for global stakeholder consultation. The duration of the period for submission of comments for the global stakeholder consultation shall be 15 days. After this period, the secretariat shall make the comments received publicly available on the UNFCCC CDM website.

5.1.4. Preparation of draft recommendation

19. The secretariat shall prepare a draft recommendation to the relevant methodological panel or working group on the proposed new methodology for which the submission has been deemed qualified, taking into account the comments received in the global stakeholder consultation, and using the form "New baseline and monitoring methodology recommendation" form (CDM-PNMR-FORM).

20. In preparing the draft recommendation, the secretariat may, taking into account the appendix to this procedure, propose that a new or revised consolidated methodology be prepared covering the scope and applicability of the proposed new methodology, by merging it with an approved methodology or revised methodology currently being developed under this procedure. In this case, the subsequent paragraphs in section 5.1 shall apply mutatis mutandis.

21. In preparing the draft recommendation, the secretariat may draw upon external expertise, depending on the technical complexity of the proposed new methodology, by selecting a maximum of two independent experts to review the submission. For this purpose, the secretariat shall establish and maintain a roster of experts. If the secretariat does not find suitable and available experts on the roster, it may use the services of experts not included on the roster.

22. The secretariat shall select two members of the relevant methodological panel or working group and forward the draft recommendation to them for their review. The selected members shall provide input on the draft recommendation within five days of receipt of it.

23. The secretariat shall finalize the recommendation, taking into account the input from the selected members of the relevant methodological panel or working group, and submit it to the panel or working group for consideration at its meeting in accordance with paragraph 10 above, at the latest seven days before the meeting.

5.1.5. Consideration by panel or working group

24. The relevant methodological panel or working group shall consider the recommendation and prepare a draft recommendation to the Board. The panel or working group shall make every effort to conclude its consideration and finalize the recommendation to the Board within three consecutive meetings. The recommendation to the Board shall be to either:

    (a) Approve the proposed new methodology ("A case"); or

    (b) Reject the proposed new methodology ("C case").

25. In preparing the draft recommendation to the Board, the relevant methodological panel or working group may, taking into account the appendix to this procedure, prepare a draft new or revised consolidated methodology covering the scope and applicability of the proposed new methodology, by merging it with an approved methodology or revised methodology currently being developed under this procedure. In this case, the subsequent paragraphs in section 5.1 shall apply mutatis mutandis.

26. If, in preparing the draft recommendation to the Board, the relevant methodological panel or working group identifies issues in the proposed new methodology that may be addressed with clarifications or modifications, the panel or working group shall request the secretariat to communicate the issues to the proponent. In this case, the proponent shall

provide clarifications or submit a modified proposed new methodology to address the identified issues to the secretariat within 28 days of the communication being made. If the proponent does not respond accordingly by this deadline, the panel or working group's submission of a final recommendation to the Board may be delayed accordingly. If the proponent does not respond accordingly within 90 days, the submission shall be considered withdrawn.

27. If the relevant methodological panel or working group's draft recommendation to the Board is to approve the proposed new methodology, the secretariat shall communicate a reformatted new methodology to the proponent before the conclusion of the meeting at which the proposal is considered. The proponent shall, within the time frame defined by the panel or working group, confirm that the reformatted new methodology is acceptable or request modifications to it, in order that the panel or working group can finalize a recommendation to the Board by the end of the meeting. If the proponent does not respond by this deadline, the panel or working group's submission of a final recommendation to the Board may be delayed accordingly.

28. The relevant methodological panel or working group shall finalize the recommendation to the Board, taking into account the proponent's responses referred to in paragraphs 26 and 27 above, and publish it in its corresponding meeting report. The secretariat shall place the recommendation to the Board on the agenda of the next Board meeting.

5.1.6. Consideration by the Board

29. At the Board meeting for which the recommendation to the Board is placed on the agenda, the Board shall decide to:

    (a) Approve the proposed new methodology as recommended by the relevant methodological panel or working group;

    (b) Reject the proposed new methodology; or

    (c) Request the relevant methodological panel or working group to review the recommendation to the Board, and provide guidance on the issues for review.

30. If the Board approves the proposed new methodology, the secretariat shall publish the approved new methodology on the UNFCCC CDM website within seven days of the approval.

5.1.7. Other

31. The secretariat shall maintain on the UNFCCC website a publicly available list of all proposed new methodologies deemed qualified for consideration by a relevant methodological panel or working group and the Board, indicating the current status in the process.

32. At any step before the Board makes a final decision, the secretariat may request the proponent to provide additional information regarding the proposed new methodology within a defined time frame to facilitate the assessment by the secretariat and/or the consideration by the relevant methodological panel or working group and/or the Board. If such information significantly affects the outcome of the assessment/consideration, the secretariat shall make the information publicly available on the UNFCCC CDM website.

5.2. Top-down process

5.2.1. Initiation

33. The Board may decide to develop a new methodology (including a new consolidated methodology) or methodological tool at any time.

34. A methodological panel or working group, or the secretariat may propose to the Board that it develop a new methodology (including a new consolidated methodology) or methodological tool at any time. In this case, the Board shall consider the proposal and decide whether to develop such methodology or methodological tool.

5.2.2. Preparation of draft new methodology or methodological tool

35. If the Board decides to develop a new methodology or methodological tool in accordance with paragraph 33 or 34 above, the secretariat shall prepare a draft development plan of the new methodology or methodological tool using the form “New baseline and monitoring methodology/methodological tool development plan” form (CDM-NMP-FORM), identifying, inter alia, the scope, applicability and time frame for development of the new methodology or methodological tool.

36. The secretariat shall select two members of the relevant methodological panel or working group and forward the draft development plan to them for their review. The selected members shall provide input on the draft development plan within five days of receipt of it.

37. The secretariat shall finalize the development plan, taking into account the input from the selected members of the relevant methodological panel or working group, within five days of receipt of the input.

38. The secretariat shall prepare a draft new methodology or methodological tool using the form “New baseline and monitoring methodology/methodological tool development” form (CDM-NMD-FORM) in accordance with the development plan.

39. In preparing the draft new methodology or methodological tool, the secretariat may draw upon external expertise, depending on the technical complexity of the new methodology or methodological tool, by selecting a maximum of two independent experts from the roster of experts referred to in paragraph 21 above, to review the draft new methodology or methodological tool. If the secretariat does not find suitable and available experts on the roster, it may use the services of experts not included on the roster.

40. The secretariat shall forward the draft new methodology or methodological tool to the selected members of the relevant methodological panel or working group for their review. The selected members shall provide input on the draft new methodology or methodological tool within five days of receipt of it.

41. The secretariat shall finalize the draft new methodology or methodological tool, taking into account the input from the selected members of the relevant methodological panel or working group, and submit it to the panel or working group for consideration at its meeting at the latest seven days before the meeting.

5.2.3. Consideration by panel or working group

42. The relevant methodological panel or working group shall consider the draft new methodology or methodological tool and prepare a draft recommendation to the Board on the draft new methodology or methodological tool.

43. The secretariat shall make the draft recommendation to the Board publicly available on the UNFCCC CDM website for global stakeholder consultation. The duration of the period for submission of comments for the global stakeholder consultation shall be 15 days. After this period, the secretariat shall make all comments received publicly available on the UNFCCC CDM website.

44. The relevant methodological panel or working group shall finalize the recommendation to the Board on the draft new methodology or methodological tool taking into account the comments received in the global stakeholder consultation, and publish it in its corresponding meeting report. For a draft new methodological tool, the recommendation shall also include a list of the existing approved methodologies that would need to be revised due to the effectiveness of the new methodological tool. The secretariat shall place the recommendation to the Board on the agenda of the next Board meeting.

5.2.4. Consideration by the Board

45. At the Board meeting for which the recommendation to the Board is placed on the agenda, the Board shall decide to:

    (a) Approve the proposed new methodology or methodological tool;

    (b) Reject the proposed new methodology or methodological tool; or

    (c) Request the relevant methodological panel or working group to review the recommendation to the Board and provide guidance on the issues for review.

46. If the Board approves the proposed new methodology or methodological tool, the secretariat shall publish the approved new methodology or methodological tool on the UNFCCC CDM website within seven days of the approval.

47. If the Board approves the proposed new methodological tool, it shall request the relevant methodological panel and/or working group to prepare draft revised methodologies to introduce references to the new methodological tool in them, based on the list in the recommendation from the relevant methodological panel or working group referred to in paragraph 44 above, following the process referred to in sections 6.2.2−6.2.4 below.

6. Revision of approved methodology or methodological tool

6.1. Bottom-up process

6.1.1. Submission of proposed revised methodology or methodological tool

48. The secretariat shall publish the schedules of the meetings of the methodological panel and working groups and the deadlines for the submission of requests for revision of an approved methodology or methodological tool to be considered by the relevant

methodological panel or working group at the corresponding meeting. The relevant panel or working group shall make every effort to initiate the consideration of the request at the meeting taking into account the priorities set by the chair of the panel or working group for that meeting.

49. The project participants of a planned CDM project activity, the coordinating/managing entity of a planned CDM PoA, a DOE, a DNA or any other stakeholder (hereinafter in section 6.1 referred to as the proponent) may, taking into account the appendix to this procedure, request the Board to revise an approved methodology or methodological tool by submitting the following documents to the secretariat through a specific interface on the UNFCCC CDM website:

    (a) The duly completed "Approved baseline and monitoring methodology/methodological tool revision request" form (CDM-AMR-FORM);

    (b) The proposed revised methodology or methodological tool, highlighting the proposed changes to the approved methodology or methodological tool;

    (c) The draft PDD of a planned CDM project activity or the draft PoA-DD of a planned PoA that intends to apply the proposed revised methodology or methodological tool, using the relevant PDD or PoA-DD form and with at least the following sections of the form and relevant appendices completed, applying the proposed revised methodology or methodological tool. The submission of a draft PDD or PoA-DD is optional at the time of submitting the request for revision of an approved methodology or methodological tool. However, it may be requested by the relevant panel or working group at a later stage to facilitate its consideration in accordance with paragraph 65 below:

        (i) For a planned CDM project activity:

            a. Description of the project activity;

            b. Application of selected approved baseline and monitoring methodology;

            c. Duration and crediting period;

        (ii) For a planned CDM PoA:

            a. General description of the PoA;

            b. Demonstration of additionality and development of eligibility criteria;

            c. Duration of the PoA;

            d. General description of a generic CPA;

            e. Application of a baseline and monitoring methodology.

50. A request for revision of an approved methodology or methodological tool shall not include proposed changes to the methodology or methodological tool that would result in the exclusion, restriction or narrowing of the applicability conditions of the methodology or methodological tool as a whole for other project activities or PoAs. If a proponent wishes that an approved methodology be revised in the way to exclude, restrict or narrow the applicability conditions of the methodology for other project activities or PoAs, the

proponent shall propose a new methodology in accordance with section 5.1 above. If a request for revision of an approved methodology is likely to result in the addition of new procedures or scenarios to more than half of the provisions of the methodology, the proponent should propose a new methodology in accordance with section 5.1 above.

6.1.2. Completeness check

51. The secretariat shall conduct a completeness check of the submission within seven days of the deadline for submissions referred to in paragraph 48 above.

52. If the secretariat finds that the submission is incomplete, it shall request the proponent to submit the missing or revised documents and/or information. In this case, the proponent shall submit the requested documents and/or information to the secretariat within five days of receipt of the request. If the proponent does not submit the requested documents and/or information by this deadline, the secretariat shall conclude that the submission is incomplete.

53. Upon conclusion of the completeness check, the secretariat shall notify the proponent of the conclusion of the completeness check. If the submission is concluded as incomplete in accordance with paragraph 52 above, the secretariat shall also communicate the underlying reason(s) to the proponent. In this case, the proponent may resubmit the proposed revised methodology or methodological tool with revised documentation at any time. Upon submission, the revised documentation shall be treated as a new submission of a request for revision of an approved methodology or methodological tool under this procedure.

6.1.3. Initial assessment

54. Upon positive conclusion of the completeness check, the secretariat shall conduct an initial assessment of the submission using the “Approved baseline and monitoring methodology/methodological tool revision request initial assessment” form (CDM-AMIA-FORM) within 30 days of the deadline for submissions referred to in paragraph 48 above, to determine whether the submission qualifies for consideration by the relevant methodological panel or working group and the Board.

55. If, during the initial assessment, the secretariat identifies minor issues in the submission, it shall request the proponent to submit the missing or revised documents and/or information. In this case, the proponent shall submit the requested documents and/or information to the secretariat within five days of receipt of the request. If the proponent does not submit the requested documents and/or information by this deadline, the secretariat shall conclude that the submission is incomplete.

56. Upon conclusion of the initial assessment, the secretariat shall notify the proponent of the conclusion of the initial assessment. If the submission is concluded as unqualified for consideration, or incomplete in accordance with paragraph 55 above, the secretariat shall also communicate the underlying reason(s) to the proponent. In this case, the proponent may resubmit the proposed revised methodology or methodological tool with revised documentation at any time. Upon submission, the revised documentation shall be treated as a new submission of a request for revision of an approved methodology or methodological tool under this procedure.

57. If the submission is concluded as qualified for consideration by the relevant methodological panel or working group and the Board, the secretariat shall make the submission publicly available on the UNFCCC CDM website for global stakeholder consultation. The duration of the period for submission of comments for the global stakeholder consultation shall be 15 days. After this period, the secretariat shall make all comments received publicly available on the UNFCCC CDM website.

6.1.4. Preparation of draft recommendation

58. The secretariat shall prepare a draft recommendation to the relevant methodological panel or working group on the proposed revised methodology or methodological tool for which the submission has been deemed qualified, taking into account the comments received in the global stakeholder consultation, and using the form "Approved baseline and monitoring methodology/methodological tool revision recommendation" form (CDM-AMRR-FORM).

59. In preparing the draft recommendation, the secretariat may, taking into account the appendix to this procedure, propose that a new or revised consolidated methodology be prepared covering the scope and applicability of the proposed revised methodology, by merging it with an approved methodology or other new or revised methodology currently being developed under this procedure. In this case, the subsequent paragraphs in section 6.1 shall apply mutatis mutandis.

60. In preparing the draft recommendation, the secretariat may draw upon external expertise, depending on the technical complexity of the proposed revised methodology or methodological tool, by selecting a maximum of two independent experts from the roster of experts referred to in paragraph 21 above to review the submission. If the secretariat does not find suitable and available experts on the roster, it may use the services of experts not included on the roster.

61. The secretariat shall select two members of the relevant methodological panel or working group and forward the draft recommendation to them for their review. The selected members shall provide input on the draft recommendation within five days of receipt of it.

62. The secretariat shall finalize the recommendation, taking into account the input from the selected members of the relevant methodological panel or working group, and submit it to the panel or working group for consideration at its meeting in accordance with paragraph 48 above, at the latest seven days before the meeting.

6.1.5. Consideration by panel or working group

63. The relevant methodological panel or working group shall consider the recommendation and prepare a draft recommendation to the Board. The panel or working group shall make every effort to conclude its consideration and finalize the recommendation to the Board within two consecutive meetings. The recommendation to the Board shall be to either:

    (a) Approve the proposed revised methodology or methodological tool ("A case"); or

    (b) Reject the proposed revised methodology or methodological tool ("C case").

64. In preparing the draft recommendation to the Board, the relevant methodological panel or working group may, taking into account the appendix to this procedure, prepare a draft new or revised consolidated methodology covering the scope and applicability of the proposed revised methodology, by merging it with an approved methodology or other new

or revised methodology currently being developed under this procedure. In this case, the subsequent paragraphs in section 6.1 shall apply mutatis mutandis.

65. In preparing the draft recommendation to the Board, the relevant methodological panel or working group may request the proponent to submit a draft PDD or PoA-DD that intends to apply the proposed revised methodology or methodological tool, in order to facilitate its consideration if it had not been submitted in the original submission of the request for revision. Also, if the panel or working group identifies issues in the proposed revised methodology or methodological tool that may be addressed with clarifications or modifications, the panel or working group shall request the secretariat to communicate the issues to the proponent. In these cases, the proponent shall submit a draft PDD or PoA-DD, provide clarifications or submit a modified proposed revised methodology or methodological tool as applicable to the secretariat within 28 days of the communication being made. If the proponent does not respond accordingly by this deadline, the panel or working group's submission of a final recommendation to the Board may be delayed accordingly. If the proponent does not respond accordingly within 90 days, the submission shall be considered withdrawn.

66. If the relevant methodological panel or working group's draft recommendation to the Board is to approve the proposed revised methodology or methodological tool, the secretariat shall communicate a reformatted revised methodology or methodological tool to the proponent before the conclusion of the meeting at which the proposal is considered. The proponent shall, within the time frame defined by the panel or working group, confirm that the reformatted revised methodology or methodological tool is acceptable or request modifications to it, in order that the panel or working group can finalize a recommendation to the Board by the end of the meeting. If the proponent does not respond by this deadline, the panel or working group's submission of a final recommendation to the Board may be delayed accordingly.

67. The relevant methodological panel or working group shall finalize the recommendation to the Board, taking into account the proponent's responses referred to in paragraphs 65 and 66 above, and publish it in its corresponding meeting report. For a proposed revised methodological tool, if the recommendation is to approve the proposed revised methodological tool, it shall also include a list of the existing approved methodologies that would need to be revised due to the effectiveness of the revised methodological tool. The secretariat shall place the recommendation to the Board on the agenda of the next Board meeting.

6.1.6. Consideration by the Board

68. At the Board meeting for which the recommendation to the Board is placed on the agenda, the Board shall decide to:

    (a) Approve the proposed revised methodology or methodological tool as recommended by the relevant methodological panel or working group, indicating that:

        (i) The revision is a major revision; or

        (ii) The revision is a minor revision;

    (b) Reject the proposed revised methodology or methodological tool; or

(c) Request the relevant methodological panel or working group to review the recommendation to the Board and provide guidance on the issues for review.

69. If the Board approves the proposed revised methodology or methodological tool, the secretariat shall publish the approved revised methodology or methodological tool on the UNFCCC CDM website within seven days of the approval.

70. If the Board approves the proposed revised methodological tool, it shall request the relevant methodological panel and/or working group to prepare draft revised methodologies to introduce or modify references to the revised methodological tool in them, based on the list in the recommendation from the relevant methodological panel or working group referred to in paragraph 67 above, following the process referred to in sections 6.2.2−6.2.4 below.

6.1.7. Other

71. The secretariat shall maintain on the UNFCCC website a publicly available list of all proposed revised methodologies and methodological tools deemed qualified for consideration by the relevant methodological panel or working group and the Board, indicating the current status in the process.

72. At any step before the Board makes a final decision, the secretariat may request the proponent to provide additional information regarding the proposed revised methodology or methodological tool within a defined time frame to facilitate the assessment by the secretariat and/or the consideration by the relevant methodological panel or working group and/or the Board. If such information significantly affects the outcome of the assessment/consideration, the secretariat shall make the information publicly available on the UNFCCC CDM website.

6.2. Top-down process

6.2.1. Initiation

73. The Board may, taking into account the appendix to this procedure, decide to revise an approved methodology (including an approved consolidated methodology) or methodological tool at any time. In this case, the Board shall also decide to:

(a) Put on hold the approved methodology or methodological tool, with immediate effect. In this case, DOEs shall not submit, through a dedicated interface on the UNFCCC CDM website, any PDD or PoA-DD for global stakeholder consultation, any request for registration or any request for renewal of crediting period of a project activity or PoA applying the methodology or methodological tool from the day following the date of publication of the Board's meeting report containing the decision;

(b) Put on hold the approved methodology or methodological tool, with a grace period of 28 days. In this case, DOEs shall not submit, through a dedicated interface on the UNFCCC CDM website, any PDD or PoA-DD for global stakeholder consultation, any request for registration or any request for renewal of crediting period of a project activity or PoA, applying the methodology or methodological tool any more than 28 days following the date of publication of the Board's meeting report containing the decision; or

(c) Maintain the current version of the approved methodology or methodological tool until the expiry of its validity, in accordance with paragraphs 88−90 below.

74. A methodological panel or working group, or the secretariat, may, taking into account the appendix to this procedure, propose that the Board revise an approved methodology (including an approved consolidated methodology) or methodological tool at any time. If the panel or working group or the secretariat considers that the current version of the methodology or methodological tool should be put on hold, it shall recommend so to the Board. In these cases, the Board shall consider the proposal and/or the recommendation, and decide whether to revise and/or to put on hold the current version of the methodology or methodological tool in accordance with paragraph 73 above.

75. Notwithstanding paragraph 74 above, if a member of a methodological panel or working group, or the secretariat, finds that it is necessary to revise an approved methodology or methodological tool to correct an obvious error, the chair and the vice-chair of the relevant methodological panel or working group may decide to directly initiate the revision.

6.2.2. Preparation of draft revised methodology or methodological tool

76. If the Board decides to revise an approved methodology or methodological tool in accordance with paragraph 73 or 74 above, or the chair and the vice-chair of the relevant methodological panel or working group decide to revise it in accordance with paragraph 75 above, the secretariat shall prepare a draft revised methodology or methodological tool.

77. In preparing the draft revised methodology or methodological tool, the secretariat may draw upon external expertise, depending on the technical complexity of the revision, by selecting a maximum of two independent experts from the roster of experts referred to in paragraph 21 above, to review the draft revised methodology or methodological tool. If the secretariat does not find suitable and available experts on the roster, it may use the services of experts not included on the roster.

78. The secretariat shall select two members of the relevant methodological panel or working group and forward the draft revised methodology or methodological tool to them for their review. The selected members shall provide input on the draft revised methodology or methodological tool within five days of receipt of it.

79. The secretariat shall finalize the draft revised methodology or methodological tool, taking into account the input from the selected members of the relevant methodological panel or working group, and submit it to the panel or working group for consideration at its meeting, at the latest seven days before the meeting.

6.2.3. Consideration by panel or working group

80. The relevant methodological panel or working group shall consider the draft revised methodology or methodological tool and prepare a draft recommendation to the Board on the draft revised methodology or methodological tool.

81. The secretariat shall make the draft recommendation to the Board publicly available on the UNFCCC CDM website for global stakeholder consultation. The duration of the period for submission of comments for the global stakeholder consultation shall be 15 days. After this period, the secretariat shall make all comments received publicly available on the UNFCCC CDM website. If the revision of an approved methodology or methodological tool

has been initiated in accordance with paragraph 47, 70, 75 above, or 85 below, global stakeholder consultation is not necessary.

82. The relevant methodological panel or working group shall finalize the recommendation to the Board on the draft revised methodology or methodological tool, taking into account the comments received in the global stakeholder consultation, and publish it in its corresponding meeting report. For a draft revised methodological tool, the recommendation shall also include a list of the existing approved methodologies that would need to be revised due to the effectiveness of the revised methodological tool. The secretariat shall place the recommendation to the Board on the agenda of the next Board meeting.

6.2.4. Consideration by the Board

83. At the Board meeting for which the recommendation to the Board is placed on the agenda, the Board shall decide to:

(a) Approve the proposed revised methodology or methodological tool, indicating that:

(i) The revision is a major revision; or

(ii) The revision is a minor revision;

(b) Reject the proposed revised methodology or methodological tool; or

(c) Request the relevant methodological panel or working group to review the recommendation to the Board and provide guidance on the issues for review.

84. If the Board approves the proposed revised methodology or methodological tool, the secretariat shall publish the approved revised methodology or methodological tool on the UNFCCC CDM website within seven days of the approval.

85. If the Board approves the proposed revised methodological tool, it shall request the relevant methodological panel and/or working group to prepare draft revised methodologies to introduce or modify references to the revised methodological tool in them, based on the list in the recommendation from the relevant methodological panel or working group referred to in paragraph 82 above, following the process referred to in sections 6.2.2−6.2.4 above.

6.2.5. Other

86. The secretariat may propose an editorial revision to an approved methodology or methodological tool at any time. In this case, the secretariat shall submit a draft revised methodology or methodological tool to the chair of the relevant methodological panel or working group for his/her review. If the chair agrees to the draft revised methodology or methodological tool, the secretariat shall publish the revised methodology or methodological tool on the UNFCCC CDM website. The editorial revision shall be noted in the next meeting report of the Board.

7. Validity of new, revised and previous versions

87. An approved new or revised methodology or methodological tool shall be effective from the date of publication on the UNFCCC CDM website. From this date, a project activity or

PoA may apply the new or revised version for the purpose of publication of a PDD or PoA-DD for global stakeholder consultation, submission of a request for registration, or submission of a request for renewal of crediting period, in accordance with the "CDM project cycle procedure".

88. If the Board approves a revised methodology or methodological tool indicating that it is a major revision in accordance with paragraph 68(a)(i) or 83(a)(i) above, the version number of the methodology or methodological tool shall increase by one whole number (e.g. from 1.0 to 2.0), and the previous version shall continue to be valid for 240 days from the date that the revised version becomes effective unless the previous version has been put on hold by the Board in accordance with paragraph 73(a) or 73(b) above. In this case, for the purpose of publication of a PDD or PoA-DD for global stakeholder consultation, submission of a request for registration, or submission of a request for renewal of crediting period in accordance with the "CDM project cycle procedure":

    (a) A project activity or PoA may still apply the previous version during this 240-day period unless the previous version has been put on hold by the Board in accordance with paragraph 73(a) or 73(b) above; and

    (b) A project activity or PoA shall apply the revised version after this 240-day period, or immediately after its adoption if the previous version has been put on hold in accordance with paragraph 73(a) or 73(b) above. If a PDD or PoA-DD applying the previous version has already been published for global stakeholder consultation, the project participants or coordinating/managing entity shall revise the PDD or PoA-DD applying the revised version. In this case, the DOE shall not publish the revised PDD or PoA-DD for global stakeholder consultation, but submit it when it submits a request for registration unless otherwise decided by the Board when it approves the revised methodology or methodological tool.

89. If the Board approves a revised methodology or methodological tool indicating that it is a minor revision in accordance with paragraph 68(a)(ii) or 83(a)(ii) above, or if an editorial revision to an approved methodology or methodological tool has been made in accordance with paragraph 86 above, the version number of the methodology or methodological tool shall increase by one fractional number (e.g. from 1.0 to 1.1), and the previous version shall continue to be valid until the next revision for mandatory use. In this case, for the purpose of publication of a PDD or PoA-DD for global stakeholder consultation, submission of a request for registration, or submission of a request for renewal of crediting period in accordance with the "CDM project cycle procedure", a project activity or PoA may still apply the previous version or any earlier version until the end of the 240-day period after the next major revision.

90. If the Board approves a new or revised consolidated methodology or methodological tool, the approved methodology or methodological tool that has been consolidated shall continue to be valid for 240 days from the date when the consolidated methodology or methodological tool becomes effective unless the approved methodology or methodological tool that has been consolidated has been put on hold by the Board in accordance with paragraph 73(a) or 73(b) above. In this case, for the purpose of publication of a PDD or PoA-DD for global stakeholder consultation, submission of a

request for registration, or submission of a request for renewal of crediting period in accordance with the "CDM project cycle procedure":

(a) A project activity or PoA may still apply the methodology or methodological tool that has been consolidated during this 240-day period unless it has been put on hold by the Board in accordance with paragraph 73(a) or 73(b) above; and

(b) A project activity or PoA shall apply the consolidated methodology or methodological tool after this 240-day period, or immediately after its adoption if the methodology or methodological tool that has been consolidated has been put on hold in accordance with paragraph 73(a) or 73(b) above. If a PDD or PoA-DD applying the methodology or methodological tool that has been consolidated has already been published for global stakeholder consultation, the project participants or coordinating/managing entity shall revise the PDD or PoA-DD applying the consolidated methodology. In this case, the DOE shall not publish the revised PDD or PoA-DD for global stakeholder consultation, but submit it when it submits a request for registration unless otherwise decided by the Board when it approves the revised methodology or methodological tool.

91. For the purpose of publication of a monitoring report and submission of a request for issuance, a project activity or PoA shall apply the version of the methodology or methodological tool that the project activity or PoA has been registered with. If the project participants or coordinating/managing entity wish to use a later version of the methodology or methodological tool for the purpose of monitoring of emission reductions or removals after the registration of the project activity or PoA, or a DOE, when performing a verification, determines that permanent changes to the monitoring plan as described in the registered PDD or PoA-DD, generic CPA-DD, or the monitoring methodology have occurred or expected to occur, the DOE shall submit a request for approval by the Board prior to the submission of the request for issuance in accordance with the relevant provisions of the "CDM project cycle procedure".

92. The revision of an approved methodology or methodological tool or the consolidation of methodologies or methodological tools shall not affect registered CDM project activities or PoAs until the end of the crediting periods during which the validity of the version of the methodology or methodological tool applied to the project activity or PoA expires.

8. Clarification of approved methodology or methodological tool

8.1. Bottom-up process

8.1.1. Submission of request for clarification

93. The secretariat shall publish the schedules of the meetings of the methodological panel and working groups and the deadlines for the submission of requests for clarification of an approved methodology or methodological tool to be considered by the relevant methodological panel or working group at the corresponding meeting. The relevant panel or working group shall make every effort to initiate the consideration of the request at the meeting, taking into account the priorities set by the chair of the panel or working group for that meeting.

94. The project participants of a planned CDM project activity or PoA, the coordinating/managing entity of a planned CDM PoA, a DOE, a DNA or any other stakeholder (hereinafter in section 8.1 referred to as the enquirer) may, taking into account the appendix to this procedure, request clarification of an approved methodology or methodological tool, by submitting, through a specific interface on the UNFCCC CDM website, the duly completed "Approved baseline and monitoring methodology/methodological tool clarification request" form (CDM-AMC-FORM) to the secretariat.

8.1.2. Completeness check

95. The secretariat shall conduct a completeness check of the submission within seven days of the deadline for submissions referred to in paragraph 93 above.

96. If the secretariat finds that the submission is incomplete, it shall request the enquirer to submit the missing or revised documents and/or information. In this case, the enquirer shall submit the requested documents and/or information to the secretariat within five days of receipt of the request. If the enquirer does not submit the requested documents and/or information by this deadline, the secretariat shall conclude that the submission is incomplete.

97. Upon conclusion of the completeness check, the secretariat shall notify the enquirer of the conclusion of the completeness check. If the submission is concluded as incomplete in accordance with paragraph 96 above, the secretariat shall communicate the underlying reason(s) to the enquirer. In this case, the enquirer may resubmit the request for clarification with revised documentation at any time. Upon submission, the revised documentation shall be treated as a new submission of a request for clarification under this procedure.

8.1.3. Initial assessment

98. Upon positive conclusion of the completeness check, the secretariat shall conduct an initial assessment of the submission using the form "Approved baseline and monitoring methodology/methodological tool clarification request initial assessment" form (CDM-ACIA-FORM) within 15 days of the deadline for submissions referred to in paragraph 93 above, to determine either that:

(a) It does not involve any regulatory and/or technical ambiguity, or involves only simple regulatory and/or technical issues, hence requires no analysis or only a simple analysis to formulate a clarification; or

(b) It involves complex regulatory and/or technical issues, hence requires a thorough analysis to formulate a clarification.

8.1.4. Fast track

99. If the submission is determined as being the case referred to in paragraph 98(a) above, the secretariat shall prepare a clarification using the form "Approved baseline and monitoring methodology/methodological tool clarification response" form (CDM-AMCR-FORM) and send it to the enquirer within 30 days of the deadline for submissions referred to in paragraph 93 above.

100. In preparing the clarification, the secretariat may consult with the relevant methodological panel or working group. In this case, the timeline referred in paragraph 99 above shall not apply. The secretariat shall send a draft clarification to the panel or working group within 30 days of the deadline for submissions referred to in paragraph 93 above. If no member of the panel or working group objects to the draft clarification within seven days of receipt of the draft clarification, the clarification shall be deemed finalized by the panel or working group. If a member of the panel or working group objects to the draft clarification, the case shall be placed on the agenda of the next meeting of the panel or working group and be treated under the regular track from the step referred to in paragraph 104 below. At the meeting where the case is placed on the agenda, the panel or working group shall make every effort to finalize the clarification within one meeting.

101. The secretariat shall publish the clarification on the UNFCCC CDM website, specifying to which version(s) of the methodology or methodological tool the clarification applies.

8.1.5. Regular track

102. If the submission is determined as being the case referred to in paragraph 98(b) above, the secretariat shall prepare a draft recommendation of a clarification to the relevant methodological panel or working group using the form “Approved baseline and monitoring methodology/methodological tool clarification response” form (CDM-AMCR-FORM).

103. In preparing the draft recommendation, the secretariat may draw upon external expertise, depending on the technical complexity of the issues in question, by selecting a maximum of two independent experts from the roster of experts referred to in paragraph 21 above to review the submission. If the secretariat does not find suitable and available experts on the roster, it may use the services of experts not included on the roster.

104. The secretariat shall select one member of the relevant methodological panel or working group and forward the draft recommendation to him/her for review. The selected member shall provide input on the draft recommendation within three days of receipt of it.

105. The secretariat shall finalize the recommendation, taking into account the input from the selected member, and submit it to the relevant methodological panel or working group for consideration at its meeting in accordance with paragraph 93 above, at the latest seven days before the meeting.

106. The relevant methodological panel or working group shall consider the recommendation, finalize the recommendation to the Board and publish it in its corresponding meeting report. The panel or working group shall make every effort to finalize the recommendation within one meeting.

107. At the Board meeting for which the recommendation to the Board is placed on the agenda, the Board shall decide to either:

(a) Approve the recommended clarification, specifying to which version(s) of the methodology or methodological tool the clarification applies; or

(b) Request the relevant methodological panel or working group to review the recommendation to the Board and provide guidance on the issues for review.

108. If the Board approves the clarification, the secretariat shall send the finalized clarification to the enquirer.

109. The secretariat shall publish the clarification on the UNFCCC CDM website.

8.1.6. Other

110. The secretariat shall maintain on the UNFCCC website a publicly available list of all requests for clarification that have been concluded as complete in accordance with paragraphs 95−97 above, indicating the current status in the process.

111. At any step before the clarification is finalized in accordance with paragraph 99, 100 or 107(a) above, the secretariat may request the enquirer to provide additional information regarding the request for clarification within a defined time frame to facilitate the assessment by the secretariat and/or the consideration by the relevant methodological panel or working group. If such information significantly affects the outcome of the consideration, the secretariat shall make the information publicly available on the UNFCCC CDM website.

8.2. Top-down process

112. If the Board, a relevant methodological panel or working group, or the secretariat finds it necessary to clarify provisions of an approved methodology or methodological tool, the process to revise the methodology or methodological tool as defined in section 6.2 above shall be followed. In this case, the revised methodology or methodological tool shall incorporate all relevant clarifications issued prior to the revision.

Appendix. Principles for revision, consolidation and clarification of methodologies and methodological tools

1. Background

1. This appendix provides guiding principles for initiating a revision to an approved methodology or methodological tool, for initiating a consolidation of methodologies in accordance with the relevant section of this procedure, and for initiating a (request for) clarification of an approved methodology or methodological tool.

2. Principles for revision

2. A revision is the modification of an approved methodology or methodological tool in order to improve it or broaden its scope and applicability.

3. A revision of an approved methodology or methodological tool may be carried out if one or more of the following conditions apply:

   (a) New or generally accepted scientific evidence indicates that emission reductions or removal enhancements will be overestimated or underestimated based on the approved methodology or methodological tool or that the reductions or enhancements may not be real, measurable and verifiable;

   (b) The applicability conditions require broadening to include more potential project activity types or conditions for use;[1]

   (c) There are identified inconsistencies, errors and/or ambiguities in the language and/or formulae used within or between methodologies or methodological tools;

   (d) Further simplification (e.g. default values) is required to improve the user-friendliness of the approved methodology or methodological tool;

   (e) Key issues clarified through a request for clarification of the approved methodology or methodological tool in accordance with section 8 of this procedure are required to be incorporated in the approved methodology or methodological tool;

   (f) There are changes to a methodological tool to which an approved methodology refers to and the changes affect the provisions of the methodology.

[1] A request for revision is suitable for situations where an approved methodology or methodological tool is not applicable to a project activity or PoA but the project activity or PoA is broadly similar to the project activities or PoAs to which the approved methodology is applicable. Similarity is based on the nature (technology/measure) of the project activity or PoA and the sources of the emissions affected by the project activity or PoA. For example, an approved methodology may not be applicable as the sources of emissions affected by the project activity are the same as those in the methodology but the technology/measure used in the project activity is not covered under the applicability conditions; or the procedures provided in the methodology for estimating emissions from sources are not applicable because of slight variations in the approach, flow of events or structure chosen in the project activity.

3. Principles for consolidation

4. The aims of consolidating methodologies or methodological tools are to: (a) make a set of approved methodologies or methodological tools more concise and user-friendly; and (b) avoid possible inconsistencies between methodologies or methodological tools. Consolidation results in the issuance of a new or revised approved consolidated methodology or methodological tool.

5. A consolidation of two or more proposed new, proposed revised and/or approved methodologies or methodological tools into a single methodology or methodological tool may be carried out if:

    (a) These methodologies or methodological tools are similar in many of their core components (e.g. applicability, approach, technology, measure, baseline determination, demonstration of additionality, emission calculation); and

    (b) A new consolidated methodology or methodological tool can be drafted on the basis of these methodologies or methodological tools, which will be applicable to all the project activities and PoAs that apply at least one of these methodologies or methodological tools.

6. A consolidated methodology or methodological tool may also include elements from other proposed new, proposed revised or approved methodologies or methodological tools that are not part of the consolidation.

7. In consolidating methodologies or methodological tools, a balance has to be made between reducing the number of methodologies or methodological tools available to project participants and coordinating/managing entities in the database, and the complexity of the methodologies and the methodological tools, in order to keep the database of methodologies and methodological tools lean and concise.

8. If a consolidated methodology or methodological tool involves an approved methodology or methodological tool, and the consolidated one fully covers the approved one having been consolidated, then the consolidated one supersedes the approved one.

9. If the range of applicability conditions of a consolidated methodology or methodological tool does not fully cover the combined range of applicability conditions of the approved methodologies or methodological tools that have been consolidated, then the original methodologies or methodological tools are not withdrawn, but revised so that their ranges of applicability conditions are limited to the project activity types for which the consolidated methodology is not applicable. In this case, the consolidation and the revision are carried out simultaneously.

4. Principles for clarification

10. A clarification on an approved methodology or methodological tool is to clarify:

    (a) The applicability of the methodology or methodological tool to a specific (planned) CDM project activity or PoA;

    (b) Various procedures provided in the methodology or methodological tool, inter alia, for identifying the baseline scenario, demonstrating additionality, estimating baseline emissions, project emissions and leakage; or

(c) Monitoring data and procedures provided in the approved methodology or methodological tool.

11. A clarification of an approved methodology or methodological tool may be requested if:

(a) Any of the provisions of the approved methodology or methodological tool are unclear or ambiguous, and there is room for interpretation of the provisions; and/or

(b) Rationale or further background information is needed regarding conditions under which the approved methodology or methodological tool is to be applied.

- - - - -

Document information

Version	*Date*	*Description*
02.1	01 September 2017	Revision to remove reference to small-scale working group
02.0	13 May 2016	EB 89, Annex 7 Revision to reflect the requirements as agreed at EB 78 and CMP.11 and to introduce additional changes based on experience gained through the operation of the procedure.
01.1	27 November 2012	Corrections of cross-references and editorial revision.
01.0	23 November 2012	EB 70, Annex 36 Initial adoption. This document supersedes and replaces the following documents on the date when it enters into force: • Procedure for the submission and consideration of a proposed new baseline and monitoring methodology for large scale CDM project activities (version 01) • Procedure for the submission and consideration of a proposed new small scale methodology (version 03) • Procedure for the submission and consideration of a proposed new baseline and monitoring methodology for large scale afforestation and reforestation CDM project activities (version 01) • Procedure for the submission and consideration of a proposed new baseline and monitoring methodology for carbon capture and storage CDM project activities (version 01.0) • Procedure for the submission and consideration of requests for revision of approved baseline and monitoring methodologies and tools for large scale CDM project activities (version 01)

Version	*Date*	*Description*
		• Procedure for the revision of an approved small scale methodology by the Executive Board (version 01) • Procedure for the submission and consideration of requests for revision of approved baseline and monitoring methodologies and tools for A/R CDM project activities (version 01) • Procedure for the submission and consideration of queries regarding the application of approved methodologies and methodological tools by designated operational entities to the Meth Panel (version 06) • Procedure for the submission and consideration of request for clarification on the application of approved small scale methodologies (version 01) • Guidance on criteria for consolidations and revision of methodologies • Clarifications for project participants on when to request revision, clarification to an approved methodology or a deviation (version 02)

Decision Class: Regulatory
Document Type: Procedure
Business Function: Methodology
Keywords: approving methodologies and tools, revising or withdrawing methodologies and tools