NEW BASELINE AND MONITORING METHODOLOGY OR METHODOLOGICAL TOOL EXPERT REVIEW FORM (Version 01.0)

INFORMATION TO BE FILLED BY THE SECRETARIAT	
Note: This form is available in digital format. Please fill out all relevant sections of the form in clear print or typing. Provide your input after the >> indicator in the space provided. DO NOT MODIFY any part of the form as doing so will invalid this application. Should you have difficulties in completing the form, please contact the UNFCCC secretariat at email: A6.4mechanism-meth@unfccc.int	
Name of the expert responsible for completing this form	>>
Position of the expert	Choose an item.
Type of standard	Choose an item.
Unique reference number	>>
Title	>>
History of submission	>>

SECTION I. CHANGES NEEDED TO ADDRESS ISSUES IN THE METHODOLOGY OR METHODOLOGICAL TOOL (IF APPLICABLE)

(1) Outline any changes needed to address issues in the methodology

(a) Major changes: (e.g.: changes in the approach towards identifying the baseline scenario and calculating baseline emissions; changes in the approach towards additionality demonstration; major amendment in applicability conditions; need for addressing potential reversals).

>>

(b) Minor changes: (e.g.: minor chances in applicability conditions; changes in monitored and non-monitored data/parameters; changes in approaches towards addressing potential leakages; minor changes in gases to be covered in sources and sinks; amendments in the section 'methodologies principles; etc.).

>>

SECTION II. GENERAL INFORMATION ON THE SUBMITTED NEW METHODOLOGY OR METHODOLOGICAL TOOL

(1) Summary description of the methodology or methodological tool

Short statements on each on how the proposed methodology or methodological tool: addresses the principles from, applies the methodological approaches from paragraph 36 of the RMPs, identifies the baseline scenario and sets the baseline in accordance with paragraph 36 of the RMPs, calculates baseline emissions, demonstrates additionality, calculates project emissions, addresses leakage, calculates emission reductions or net removals, and if applicable addresses non-permanence.

Note to reviewers: This section should provide your stand-alone step-by-step summary description of the proposed new methodology.

Suggested length: 1/2 page.

>>

(2) Relationship with approved or pending methodologies (if applicable)

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

>>

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

>>

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

>>

(d) *Please briefly note any significant differences or inconsistencies (baseline approaches, alignment with principles of paragraph 36 of the RMPs, baseline emission calculations, leakage methods, and boundary definitions, etc.) between the proposed new methodology or methodological tool and already-approved methodology (or methodological tool) of similar scope.*

>>

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

>>

SECTION III. DETAILS OF THE EVALUATION OF THE PROPOSED NEW METHODOLOGY

(1) Applicability conditions

(a) *State the applicability conditions as provided in the proposed new baseline and monitoring methodology or methodological tool form.*

>>

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

>>

(c) *Explain whether sufficient guidance, if required, is provided to check the compliance of key applicability conditions of the methodology (or methodological tool) with the project. If yes, what are the possible means to demonstrate compliance?*

>>

(2) Alignment with the requirements for the development and assessment of Article 6.4 mechanism methodologies[1]
(a) Explain how the methodology encourages ambition over time. >>
(b) Explain how the methodology or methodological tool ensures that emission reductions or removals are real, transparent, conservative and credible. >>
(c) Explain how the business-as-usual scenario is identified. >>
(d) Explain how the methodology contributes to equitable sharing of mitigation benefits among participating Parties. >>
(e) Explain how the methodology (or methodological tool) aligns with the policies, options and implementation plans of the host Party with regard to (i) The NDC of each participating Party, (ii) The LT-LEDS of each participating Party, if it has submitted one and (iii) The long-term temperature goals and long-term goals of the Paris Agreement. >>
(f) Explain how the methodology encourages broad participation. >>
(g) Explain whether the methodology (or methodological tool) includes relevant assumptions, parameters, data sources and key factors. >>
(3) Definition of the project boundary
(a) State how the project boundary is defined in terms of: *(i) Gases and sources/sinks.* >>
(ii) Physical delineation. >>
(b) Indicate whether the project boundary adequately covers all key components/emissions sources and sinks of projects and baseline situations. If not, what further information could be included? >>
(4) Determining the baseline scenario
(a) Explain which is(are) the approach(es) from paragraph 36 of the RMPs applied for setting the baseline.

[1] Refer to the standard for application of the requirements of Chapter V.B (Methodologies) for the development and assessment of Article 6.4 mechanism methodologies (A6.4-STAN-METH-001).

>>

(b) *Explain whether the approach for setting the baseline is appropriate, considering the justification for provided for the choice and the provisions set in section 4.6 of the standard 'Application of the requirements of Chapter V.B (Methodologies) for the development and assessment of Article 6.4 mechanism methodologies'.*

>>

(c) *Explain how the downward adjustment was applied in accordance with section 4.7 of the standard 'Application of the requirements of Chapter V.B (Methodologies) for the development and assessment of Article 6.4 mechanism methodologies'.*

>>

(d) *Explain how the approach for setting the baseline results in emission that are below BAU in accordance with section 4.7 of the standard 'Application of the requirements of Chapter V.B (Methodologies) for the development and assessment of Article 6.4 mechanism methodologies'.*

>>

(5) Assessment of additionality

(a) *Explain how the methodology requires demonstration of the prior consideration of the benefits of the mechanism.*

>>

(b) *Explain how the methodology requires demonstration of the avoidance of lock-in.*

>>

(c) *Explain how the methodology requires demonstration that the proposed activity represents mitigation that exceeds any mitigation that is required by law or regulation unless the law or regulation refers to or formally integrates the mechanism as an instrument for implementation. A law or regulation applicable to the proposed activity that may require a certain technological, performance or management action shall be considered, noting that regulatory environments vary.*

>>

(d) *Explain how additionality is demonstrated through:*

(i) Demonstration that the proposed activity would not have occurred in the absence of the incentives from the mechanism through an investment analysis (default approach).

>>

(ii) Explain how the methodology assesses the barriers to the implementation of the activity, such as financial and institutional barriers, first of its kind, taking into account all relevant national policies, including legislation and current practices within the activity sector and geographic area including Indigenous Traditional Knowledge and customary laws. To demonstrate additionality for their activity, through barrier analysis, activity participants shall:

(ii.a) Describe the barriers, including the reasons why investment analysis is not sufficient; and

(ii.b) Evidence the barriers and how the mechanism will help overcome the barriers; and

>>

(iii) Describe how the methodology requires a common practice analysis to complement the investment and barrier analysis by demonstrating that the measure or technology is not already widespread through an analysis of the extent to which the proposed project type (e.g. technology or practice) has already diffused in the relevant sector and region.

>>

(e) *If the methodology selects performance-based approaches as an alternative to (d) (default approach) for demonstrating additionality, explain how the following conditions are demonstrated and justify their adequacy for assessing and demonstrating additionality:*

(i) The use of baseline approach(es) in paragraph 36 (i) or (ii) of the RMPs;

(ii) That the technologies or practices applied in the activity outperform an ambitious threshold for emissions or emissions reductions, market penetration, or other unique characteristics, set at least at the level referred to in paragraph 36 (ii) of the RMPs.

>>

(f) *Indicate which are the requirements for demonstrating additionality through approaches set by the host Party.*

>>

(6) Methodological basis for the calculation of the baseline emissions, project emissions, leakage and emission reductions or net GHG removals

(a) *Baseline and BAU emissions*

(i) Are the baseline scenario and BAU scenario well described?

>>

(ii) Are all the necessary components of the baseline scenario described under the methodology (or methodological tool) and well covered under baseline emissions?

>>

(iii) Are the baseline emissions equations correct and consistent, including equations for different options?

>>

(iv) Are the equations for the calculation of BAU emissions correct and consistent, including equations for different options?

>>

(v) Provide comments on the conservativeness of baseline and BAU emissions.

>>

(vi) Provide comments on the practical aspects of estimation of baseline and BAU emissions.

>>

(vii) Are baseline and BAU emissions under the PDD consistent with the methodology or methodological tool?

>>

(viii) Provide any additional comment on baseline and BAU emissions.

>>

(b) *Project emissions*

(i) Is the project situation well described?

>>

(ii) *Are all the necessary components of the project technology described under the methodology or methodological tool and well covered under project emissions?*

>>

(iii) *Are the project emissions equations correct and consistent, including equations for different options? If a methodological tool is needed, has it been correctly quoted?*

>>

(iv) *Provide comments on the conservativeness of project emissions.*

>>

(v) *Provide comments on the practical aspects of estimation of project emissions.*

>>

(vi) *Are project emissions under the PDD consistent with the methodology or methodological tool?*

>>

(vii) *Provide any additional comment on project emissions.*

>>

(c) *Leakage*

(i) *Does the methodology either identify potential sources of leakage or contain provisions for identifying them?*

>>

(ii) *Does the methodology contain provisions for to avoiding or minimizing all sources of leakage as far as possible?*

>>

(iii) *Does the methodology contain provisions for addressing the leakage that could not be avoided or minimized, including equations?*

>>

(iv) *Are leakage under the PDD consistent with the methodology or methodological tool?*

>>

(v) *Provide any additional comment on leakage.*

>>

(7) Methodologies principles

(a) *Does the methodology (or methodological tool) comply with the requirement(s) for "encouraging ambition over time"?*

>>

(b) *Does the methodology (or methodological tool) comply with the requirement(s) for "contributing to the equitable sharing of mitigation benefits between participating Parties"?*

>>
(c) *Does the methodology (or methodological tool) comply with the requirement(s) for "aligning with the NDC of each participating Party, if applicable, its LT-LEDS, if it has submitted one, the long-term temperature goal of the Paris Agreement and the long-term goals of the Paris Agreement"* >>
(d) *Does the methodology (or methodological tool) comply with the requirement(s) for "Encouraging broad participation"?* >>
(e) *Does the methodology (or methodological tool) comply with the requirement(s) for "including data sources, accounting for uncertainty and monitoring"* >>
(f) *Does the methodology (or methodological tool) comply with the requirement(s) for "taking into account policies and measures and relevant circumstances"* >>
(8) Data and parameters <u>not</u> monitored
(a) *Explain whether the vintage (in relation to the duration of the crediting period of the project) of data is appropriate, indicating the period covered by the data. If not, outline required changes.* >>
(b) *Give your expert judgement on whether the data and the measurement procedures (if any) used are adequate, consistent, accurate, reliable and cost effective. Identify those, if any, which are problematic and outline required changes.* >>
(c) *Are the parameters described in the monitoring methodology (or methodological tool) consistent with the baseline emission sections? If not, state possible data gaps.* >>
(9) Key data and parameters monitored
(a) *Give your expert judgement on whether the data sources and measurement procedures (if any) used are adequate, consistent, accurate, reliable and cost effective. If not, outline required changes.* >>
(b) *Give your expert judgement on whether the monitoring frequency for the data and parameters is appropriate. If not, outline required changes.* >>
(c) *Give your expert judgement on whether the QA/QC procedures are appropriate. If not, outline required changes.* >>
(d) *Are the parameters described in the monitoring methodology (or methodological tool) consistent with the project and leakage emission sections? If not, state possible data gaps.* >>

(10) Addressing non-permanence and reversals
(a) Explain how the methodology (or methodological tool) addresses non-permanence and reversals of emission reductions. >>
(11) Any other comments
(a) State which other source(s) of information (i.e. other than documentation on this proposed methodology or methodological tool available on the UNFCCC Article 6.4 mechanism web site) have been used by you in evaluating this methodology or methodological tool. Please provide specific references. >>
(b) Indicate further comments. >>
Date and signature of the desk reviewer. Click to enter a date. _____

SECTION IV. INFORMATION TO BE COMPLETED BY THE SECRETARIAT	
Date when the form was received by the UNFCCC secretariat	Click to enter a date.
Date of transmission to the Methodology Expert Panel and Supervisory Body of the Mechanism	Click to enter a date.
Date of posting in the UNFCCC Article 6.4 web site	Click to enter a date.

- - - - -

Document information

Version	*Date*	*Description*
01.0	18 December 2024	Initial publication of form template.

Decision Class: Regulatory
Document Type: Form
Business Function: Methodology
Keywords: A6.4 mechanism, desk review, developing methodologies and tools