



**Proposed New A/R Methodology Expert Form – Second Review
(version 04)**
(To be used by the second reviewer providing a desk review for a proposed new A/R methodology)

<i>Name of expert responsible for completing and submitting this form</i>	
<i>Related F-CDM-AR-NM document ID number</i>	
<i>Title of the proposed new A/R baseline and monitoring methodology</i>	
<p>History of submission (to be communicated to reviewers by the UNFCCC secretariat): (Note to reviewers: if the methodology is a re-submission, please read the previous version and the associated A/R WG recommendations). >></p>	
<p><i>Note to reviewers: Please provide recommendations on the proposed new A/R baseline and monitoring methodology based on an assessment of the CDM-AR-NM and of its application in the draft CDM-AR-PDD and public inputs. Please ensure that the form is complete in all respects and that arguments and expert judgments are substantiated.</i></p>	
Evaluation of the proposed new A/R methodology by the second reviewer	
SECTION I: SOURCE, DEFINITIONS AND APPLICABILITY	
<i>Evaluate Section I of the CDM-AR-NM. Please provide your comments under each heading in this section</i>	
<p>(1) Sources</p> <p>(a) <i>Does the proposed new A/R methodology include part(s) of an already-approved A/R methodology or an A/R methodology pending approval? If so, please briefly note the relevant methodology reference numbers (AR-AMXXXX, AR-ACMXXXX or ARNMXXXX), titles and parts included;</i> >></p> <p>(b) <i>In particular, is the proposed new A/R methodology largely an amendment or extension of an approved A/R 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);</i> >></p> <p>(c) <i>Please briefly note any significant differences or inconsistencies between the proposed new A/R methodology and already approved A/R methodology of similar scope;</i> >></p>	

**F-CDM-AR-NMex_2d**

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

>>

(2) Selected baseline approach from paragraph 22 of the A/R CDM modalities and procedures

>>

(3) Definitions

Please provide your assessment of the definitions developed for use in the proposed new A/R methodology, if any. If necessary, explain any changes that should be made to the definitions.

>>

(4) Applicability

Please provide your assessment of the applicability conditions of the proposed new A/R methodology (e.g. national and regional circumstances/policies, data and resource availability, environmental conditions, past land-use and land-use changes). If necessary, explain any changes that should be made to the applicability conditions.

>>

SECTION II: BASELINE METHODOLOGY PROCEDURE

Please evaluate each section of CDM-AR-NM and provide your comments section by section

(1) Project boundary and eligibility of land

Assess the methodological procedure to identify the delineation of the land areas included in the project boundary. Explain the shortcomings and list the required changes (if any).

>>

(2) Identification of the baseline scenario and demonstration of additionality

(a) *State whether the methodology provides an appropriate stepwise approach for identifying the possible candidate baseline scenarios and a procedure for determining the most likely baseline scenario (taking into account paragraph 20 and 21 of the A/R modalities and procedures). Explain the shortcomings and list the required changes, if any;*

>>

(b) *State whether the determination of baseline scenario is consistent with the applicability conditions of the methodology and if not, why?*

>>

(c) *State whether the procedure to demonstrate additionality is consistent with the procedure to identify the most plausible baseline scenario. If not, identify the inconsistencies.*

>>

**(3) Stratification**

Explain whether the methodology provides for an appropriate approach for stratification of the proposed A/R project activity. Identify any shortcomings and list the required changes.

>>

(4) Baseline net GHG removals by sinks

(a) State whether the methodology provides a complete approach for ex ante estimation of baseline net GHG removal by sinks. Explain whether the approach is appropriate and, if not, explain the shortcomings and list required changes.

>>

(b) Provide an assessment of the appropriateness and correctness of the methodological procedure to calculate baseline net GHG removals by sinks, including an assessment of:

(i) The choice of algorithms/formulae and/or models used and correctness of their application (e.g. mathematical deficiencies, inconsistencies in calculus of dimensions);

>>

(ii) The appropriateness (adequacy, consistency, accuracy and reliability) of the parameters provided by the methodology;

>>

(iii) The appropriateness of procedures how project participants should select any parameters in cases where values of these parameters are not provided in the methodology (e.g. from official statistics, expert judgment, proprietary data, IPCC Good Practice Guidance for LULUCF, commercial data and scientific literature);

>>

(iv) State whether the procedure results in a conservative estimation of the sum of the changes in carbon stocks in the carbon pools within the project boundary that would have occurred in the absence of the proposed A/R CDM project activity, taking into account the uncertainties associated with data and parameters used. Assess whether the procedure can be carried out in an unambiguous way, replicated, and subjected to a validation study. Explain the shortcomings and list the required changes, if any.

>>

(5) Actual net GHG removals by sinks

Provide an assessment of the appropriateness and mathematical correctness of the methodological procedure to calculate actual net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks. Explain any shortcomings and list the required changes.

(a) Provide an assessment of the appropriateness and mathematical correctness of the methodological procedure to calculate ex ante actual net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks. Explain any shortcomings and list the required changes. Include an assessment of:

>>

**F-CDM-AR-NMex_2d**

- (i) *The choice of algorithms/formulae and/or models used and correctness of their application (e.g. mathematical deficiencies, inconsistencies in calculus of dimensions);*
>>
- (ii) *The appropriateness (adequacy, consistency, accuracy and reliability) of the parameters used in the methodology;*
>>
- (iii) *State, whether the procedure may lead to systematic overestimation of the actual net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks, taking into account the uncertainties associated with the data and parameters used. Assess whether the procedure can be carried out in an unambiguous way, replicated, and subjected to a validation and/or verification study. Identify any shortcomings and list the required changes.*
>>

(6) Leakage

- (a) *State and explain whether the choice which leakage emission sources are considered is appropriate. Indicate any important leakage emissions sources that have been neglected in the context of applicability conditions;*
>>
- (b) *Provide an assessment of the appropriateness and mathematical correctness of the methodological procedure to calculate ex ante leakage emissions. Explain any shortcomings and list the required changes.*
>>

(Please note that even if the calculation of the leakage is to be performed ex post, the methodology should include the calculation of an ex ante estimate).

(7) Net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks

- (a) *State whether the methodology ensures that the net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks are estimated in conservative manner, taking into account the uncertainties associated with the data and parameters used. If not explain the shortcomings and list the required changes.*
>>
- (b) *Provide an assessment of the appropriateness and mathematical correctness of the methodological procedure to calculate ex ante actual net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks. Explain any shortcomings and list the required changes.*
>>

(8) Data and parameters not monitored (default or possibly measured one time)

State, whether the compilation of data not monitored is complete, appropriate and justified. Explain any shortcomings and list the required changes.

>>

**SECTION III: MONITORING METHODOLOGY**

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

(1) Monitoring of project implementation

Assess the appropriateness of the procedure to monitor and document the implementation of the project on land areas within project boundary. Explain any shortcomings and list the required changes.

>>

(2) Sampling design and stratification

Assess the appropriateness and correctness of the sampling design procedures for the ex post calculation of actual net GHG removals by sinks and determination of the ex post baseline net GHG removals by sinks (if required). The sampling design may, include determination of number of plots, plot distribution, etc. Explain any shortcomings and list the required changes.

>>

(3) Data and parameters monitored

State whether the compilation of data is complete, appropriate, and justified. Explain any shortcomings and list the required changes.

>>

(4) Conservative Approach and Uncertainties

State, whether the methodology takes into account uncertainties by appropriate choice of monitoring methods, such as number of samples, to achieve reliable estimates of net anthropogenic greenhouse gas removals by sinks. State whether the methodology ensures that the net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks are estimated in conservative manner, taking into account the uncertainties of the methodology. If not explain the shortcomings and list the required changes.

>>

(5) References

>>



F-CDM-AR-NMex_2d

PRESENTATION OF THE METHODOLOGY

Assessment of the description and consistency of the methodology

(a) *State whether the A/R monitoring methodology has been described in an adequate and transparent manner. If not, explain the shortcomings and list the required changes.*

>>

(b) *Indicate any further comments:*

>>

SUMMARY OF CHANGES NEEDED TO IMPROVE THE METHODOLOGY

Outline any changes needed to improve the A/R baseline and monitoring methodology:

(a) *Major changes:*

>>

(b) *Other changes:*

>>

Signature of the reviewer:

Date: / /

Information to be completed by the secretariat

F-CDM-AR-Nmex_2d doc ID number	
Date when the form was received at the UNFCCC secretariat	
Date of transmission to the A/R WG and to the Board	
Date of posting on the UNFCCC CDM website	



History of the document

Version	Date	Nature of revision
04	EB 55, Annex 25 30 July 2010	The revision ensures consistency with the form for the submission of new baseline and monitoring methodologies (CDM AR-NM). Due to the overall modification of the document, no highlights of the changes are provided.
03	EB 32, Annex 23 22 June 2007	The revision ensures consistency with the form for the submission of new baseline and monitoring methodologies (CDM AR-NM), as well as the equivalent forms of the Meth Panel.
02	EB 25, Annex 23 21 July 2006	The revision ensures consistency with the form for the submission of new baseline and monitoring methodologies (CDM-AR-NM), as well as the equivalent forms of the Meth Panel.
01	EB 22, Annex 13 (c) 25 November 2005	Initial adoption.
Decision Class: Regulatory Document Type: Form Business Function: Methodology		