

A6.4-SB005-AA-A05

Draft Procedure

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

Version 01.0



United Nations
Framework Convention on
Climate Change

COVER NOTE

1. Procedural background

1. The Supervisory Body, at its fourth meeting, considered the concept note “Process for development of methodologies, methodological tools and standardized baselines”,¹ and requested the secretariat to prepare the draft procedure for the development of methodologies, methodological tools and standardized baselines for consideration by the Supervisory Body at its next meeting (SB 005, 31 May–3 June, 2023).

2. Purpose

2. The purpose of this document is to define processes for the development of methodologies and methodological tools for consideration by the Supervisory Body.

3. Key issues and proposed solutions

3. The draft procedure has been developed based on the guidance provided by the Supervisory Body at its last meeting:²
 - a) The Supervisory Body will establish a methodological expert panel comprised of 10 members, drawing on the roster of methodological experts;
 - b) The methodological expert panel will be chaired by two of the Supervisory Body members/alternates;
 - c) The roster of methodological experts may be grouped into several working groups. The methodological expert panel may utilize the expertise of working groups as required;
 - d) The operationalization of the methodological expert panel and working groups should be linked to a methodology-related workplan and occur on a progressive basis (e.g. the methodological expert panel and working groups are formed, but will be engaged on an “on demand” basis, and in the interim the Supervisory Body may engage a small number of experts from the roster on a case-by-case basis;
 - e) The secretariat will work with the methodological expert panel and working groups, and a final recommendation will be made by the methodological expert panel;
 - f) The Supervisory Body agreed to always consider the cases at its meetings, as indicated in Option A in paragraph 26 of the concept note and agreed that it may

¹ As contained in document A6.4-SB004-AA-A08 available at:
<https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/a64-sb004-aa-a08.pdf>.

² As contained in document A6.4-SB004 paragraph 19 available at:
<https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/a64-sb004.pdf>.

include other simplified fast-track approaches in the future after more experience is gained.

4. The proposed key changes compared to the corresponding procedure under the CDM are as follows:
- (a) **Bottom-up submission of a new methodological tool:** It is proposed that stakeholders should be allowed to propose new methodological tools, that are not currently practiced under the CDM. (see **paragraph 4** of this draft procedure);
 - (b) **Development, revision and clarification of other types of methodological standards³:** It is proposed that the development, revision and clarification of other types of methodological products, such as the standard and guidelines related to sampling and surveys, should also be covered in this procedure. Currently, under the CDM, there is no specific procedure for both top-down and bottom-up development, revision, or clarification of other types of methodological standards, except through the “Procedure: Direct communication with stakeholders,” in which stakeholders can submit their inputs and questions. In the proposed draft procedure, such cases may be processed following the same processes applicable for the development, revision or clarifications of approved methodologies and methodological tools (see **paragraph 5** of this draft procedure);
 - (c) **Prioritization of methodologies through the top-down process:** It is proposed that the Supervisory Body may consider prioritizing the development or revision of methodologies that are (i) particularly useful for host Parties that are least developed countries and small island developing States as a means to meet the requirement in paragraph 29 of the “Rules, modalities and procedures for the mechanism established by Article 6, paragraph 4 of the Paris Agreement”, subject to availability of resources; (ii) applicable to programmes of activities (PoAs) through the top-down process, particularly for the PoAs that contribute to the sustainable development of the host Parties and that facilitate the involvement of small and micro businesses, taking into account the request from the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement in paragraph 5(g) of decision 3/CMA.3.; and (iii) that promote transformative climate action at the global scale (see **paragraphs 33 and 75** of this draft procedure);
 - (d) **Consultation with relevant working group:** In preparing the draft recommendation (bottom-up cases) or the draft methodology or methodological tool (top-down cases), it is proposed that the secretariat and the selected members of the methodological expert panel may consult with the relevant working group comprised of sectoral experts on the roster. In this way, a broader range of technical expertise and experience from the roster of experts may be accessed and utilized. Also, consultation with the relevant working group will be helpful to make more comprehensive recommendations (see **paragraphs 22, 40, 63, 82, and 109** of this draft procedure);
 - (e) **Speedy consultation on clarifications:** It is recommended that the Supervisory Body consider clarifications processed under the regular track through electronic consultation. Only if at least one Supervisory Body member or alternate member

³ Other types of methodological standards refer to standards that are not methodologies or methodological tools.

requests further discussion at a Supervisory Body meeting will such a case be considered at the next meeting. Otherwise, clarification is deemed adopted (See **paragraphs 112, 113 and 114** of this draft procedure.)

5. Regarding the **review of CDM methodologies and methodological tools** to adapt to the Article 6.4 mechanism, it is proposed that the **same process as proposed in section 5.2 for the top-down development** of methodologies and methodological tools should be applied for the preparation of draft recommendations and consideration by the Supervisory Body of the revised methodologies and methodological tools.

4. Impacts

6. An efficient and effective process for the development, consideration and approval of methodological products will be crucial for the Supervisory Body to ensure the availability of robust methodologies, methodological tools, and standardized baselines to activity participants, designated operational entities and other stakeholders in a timely manner, following rigorous technical assessment. This will facilitate a quick start to the Article 6.4 mechanism.

5. Subsequent work and timelines

7. The draft procedure will be revised, taking into account feedback from the Supervisory Body, and will be considered by the Supervisory Body at its next meeting (SB 006, 10–13 July 2023).

6. Recommendations to the Supervisory Body

8. The Supervisory Body may wish to consider the draft procedure and provide guidance for further work.

TABLE OF CONTENTS	Page
1. INTRODUCTION	7
2. SCOPE, APPLICABILITY AND ENTRY INTO FORCE	7
2.1. Scope	7
2.2. Applicability	7
2.3. Entry into force	8
3. NORMATIVE REFERENCES	8
4. DEFINITIONS	8
5. DEVELOPMENT OF NEW METHODOLOGY OR METHODOLOGICAL TOOL	8
5.1. Bottom-up process	8
5.1.1. Submission of proposed new methodology or methodological tool	8
5.1.2. Completeness check.....	9
5.1.3. Initial assessment.....	10
5.1.4. Preparation of draft recommendation	10
5.1.5. Consideration by methodological expert panel.....	11
5.1.6. Consideration by the Supervisory Body	12
5.1.7. Other	12
5.2. Top-down process.....	12
5.2.1. Initiation	12
5.2.2. Preparation of draft new methodology or methodological tool	13
5.2.3. Consideration by methodological expert panel.....	14
5.2.4. Consideration by the Supervisory Body	14
6. REVISION OF APPROVED METHODOLOGY OR METHODOLOGICAL TOOL	15
6.1. Bottom-up process	15
6.1.1. Submission of proposed revised methodology or methodological tool	15
6.1.2. Completeness check.....	16
6.1.3. Initial assessment.....	16
6.1.4. Preparation of draft recommendation	17

- 6.1.5. Consideration by methodological expert panel..... 18
- 6.1.6. Consideration by the Supervisory Body 19
- 6.1.7. Other 19
- 6.2. Top-down process..... 20
 - 6.2.1. Initiation 20
 - 6.2.2. Preparation of draft revised methodology or methodological tool..... 21
 - 6.2.3. Consideration by methodological expert panel..... 21
 - 6.2.4. Consideration by the Supervisory Body 22
 - 6.2.5. Other 22
- 7. VALIDITY OF NEW, REVISED AND PREVIOUS VERSIONS 23**
- 8. CLARIFICATION OF APPROVED METHODOLOGY OR METHODOLOGICAL TOOL..... 24**
 - 8.1. Bottom-up process 24
 - 8.1.1. Submission of request for clarification 24
 - 8.1.2. Completeness check..... 25
 - 8.1.3. Initial assessment..... 25
 - 8.1.4. Fast track..... 25
 - 8.1.5. Regular track..... 26
 - 8.1.6. Other 27
 - 8.2. Top-down process..... 27
- APPENDIX. PRINCIPLES FOR REVISION, CONSOLIDATION AND CLARIFICATION OF METHODOLOGIES AND METHODOLOGICAL TOOLS..... 28**

1. Introduction

1. The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement (CMA), at its third session, adopted decision 3/CMA.3, containing in its annex the “Rules, modalities and procedures for the mechanism established by Article 6, paragraph 4 of the Paris Agreement” (RMPs), setting out principles, key requirements and processes of the mechanism (hereinafter referred to as the Article 6.4 mechanism).¹ The aforementioned decision and the RMPs contain, inter alia, provisions for the Supervisory Body to advance work related to methodologies and standardized baselines.
2. Given the mandates above, the Supervisory Body included the provisions to develop the process for the development, consideration, and approval of methodologies, methodological tools, and standardized baselines in its workplan for 2022–2023,² with the aim to complete the process by 2023.

2. Scope, applicability and entry into force

2.1. Scope

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

2.2. Applicability

4. This procedure applies to:
 - (a) All “bottom-up”³ cases and “top-down”⁴ cases for the development of new methodologies and methodological tools;
 - (b) All “bottom-up” cases and “top-down” cases for the revision of approved methodologies and methodological tools;
 - (c) All “bottom-up” cases and “top-down” cases for the provision of clarification for approved methodologies and methodological tools.
5. This procedure also applies to “bottom-up” cases and “top-down” cases for the development, revision and clarification of other types of methodological products, such as the standard and guidelines related to sampling and surveys. Such cases shall be

¹ See document FCCC/PA/CMA/2021/10/Add.1 available at: <https://unfccc.int/documents/460950>.

² Available at: <https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/a64-sb002-a02.pdf>.

³ In this document, the term “bottom-up” refers to cases where activity participants of Article 6.4 mechanism activities, host Parties, designated operational entities (DOEs) or other stakeholders initiate the process by submitting a proposal or a request to the secretariat.

⁴ In this document, the term “top-down” refers to cases where the Supervisory Body, initiates the process based on inputs from the methodological expert panel, or the secretariat, where relevant.

processed following the same processes applicable for the development, revision and clarifications of approved methodologies and methodological tools.

2.3. Entry into force

6. Version 01.0 of this procedure shall be effective from DD Month YYYY.

3. Normative references

7. The following referenced documents are indispensable for the application of this procedure:
 - (a) "Procedure: Article 6.4 mechanism activity cycle";
 - (b) "Glossary: Article 6.4 mechanism terms".

4. Definitions

8. In addition to the definitions in the "Glossary: Article 6.4 mechanism 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.

5. Development of new methodology or methodological tool

5.1. Bottom-up process

5.1.1. Submission of proposed new methodology or methodological tool

9. The secretariat shall publish the schedules of the meetings of the methodological expert panel and the deadlines for the submission of proposals for new methodologies to be considered by the methodological expert panel at the corresponding meetings. The methodological expert panel shall make every effort to initiate the consideration of the proposals submitted on time at the meeting, taking into account the priorities set by the chair of the methodological expert panel at that meeting.
10. The activity participants of a planned project, the coordinating/managing entity of a planned PoA, a host Party, a DOE or any other stakeholder (hereinafter in section 5.1 referred to as the proponent) may propose a new methodology or methodological tool to the Supervisory Body by submitting the following documents through a specific interface on the UNFCCC website to the secretariat:
 - (a) The completed "Form: New baseline and monitoring methodology or methodological tool proposal";
 - (b) The proposed new methodology or methodological tool using the relevant form;

- (c) The draft project design document (PDD) of the planned project or the draft programme design document (PoA-DD) of the planned PoA that intends to apply the proposed new 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 new methodology or methodological tool:
 - (i) For planned project:
 - a. Description of project;
 - b. Application of selected baseline and monitoring methodology or methodological tool;
 - c. Duration and crediting period;
 - (ii) For planned 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 CPA⁵;
 - e. Application of a baseline and monitoring methodology or methodological tool to the CPA.

5.1.2. Completeness check

- 11. The secretariat shall conduct a completeness check of the submission within seven days of the deadline for submissions referred to in paragraph 9 above.
- 12. 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 and stop further processing of the submission.
- 13. 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 12 above, the secretariat shall communicate the underlying reason(s) to the proponent. In this case, the proponent may resubmit the proposed new methodology or methodological tool with revised documentation at any time. Upon submission, the revised documentation shall be treated as a new submission of a proposed new methodology or methodological tool under this procedure.

⁵ CPA is a component project activity, which is a single measure, or a set of interrelated measures under a Article 6.4 mechanism PoA, to reduce GHG emissions or result in net anthropogenic GHG removals, applied within a designated area defined in the baseline methodology(ies).

5.1.3. Initial assessment

14. Upon a positive conclusion of the completeness check, the secretariat shall conduct an initial assessment of the submission using the “Form: New baseline and monitoring methodology or methodological tool initial assessment” within 30 days of the deadline for submissions referred to in paragraph 9 above, to determine whether the submission qualifies for consideration by the methodological expert panel and the Supervisory Body.
15. 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 and stop further processing of the submission.
16. 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 15 above, the secretariat shall communicate the underlying reason(s) to the proponent. In this case, the proponent may resubmit the proposed new methodology or methodological tool with revised documentation at any time. Upon submission, the revised documentation shall be treated as a new submission of a proposed new methodology or methodological tool under this procedure.
17. If the submission is concluded as qualified for consideration, the secretariat shall issue a unique reference number to the proposed new methodology or methodological tool and make the submission publicly available on the UNFCCC 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 website.

5.1.4. Preparation of draft recommendation

18. The secretariat shall prepare a draft recommendation to the methodological expert panel on the proposed new 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: New baseline and monitoring methodology or methodological tool recommendation”.
19. 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*.
20. In preparing the draft recommendation, the secretariat may draw upon external expertise, depending on the technical complexity of the proposed new methodology or methodological tool, by selecting a maximum of two independent experts to review the submission. For this purpose, the secretariat shall use a roster of methodological experts

established by the Supervisory Body. 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.

21. The secretariat shall select two members of the methodological expert panel 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.
22. Furthermore, in preparing the draft recommendation, the secretariat and the selected members of the methodological expert panel may consult with the relevant working group comprised of the sectoral experts on the roster. For the purpose of this consultation, the roster of methodological experts may be grouped into several working groups (e.g. working group for renewable energy, working group for transport, working group for waste).
23. The secretariat shall finalize the recommendation, taking into account the input from the selected members of the methodological expert panel and the relevant working group, and submit it to the methodological expert panel for consideration at its meeting in accordance with paragraph 9 above, at the latest seven days before the meeting.

5.1.5. Consideration by methodological expert panel

24. The methodological expert panel shall consider the recommendation and prepare a draft recommendation to the Supervisory Body. The methodological expert panel shall make every effort to conclude its consideration and finalize the recommendation to the Supervisory Body within three consecutive meetings. The recommendation to the Supervisory Body shall be to either:
 - (a) Approve the proposed new methodology or methodological tool (“A case”); or
 - (b) Reject the proposed new methodology or methodological tool (“C case”).
25. In preparing the draft recommendation to the Supervisory Body, the methodological expert panel 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 Supervisory Body, the methodological expert panel identifies issues in the proposed new methodology or methodological tool that may be addressed with clarifications or modifications, the methodological expert panel shall request the secretariat to communicate the issues to the proponent (“B case”). In this case, the proponent shall provide clarifications or submit a modified proposed new methodology or methodological tool 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’s submission of a final recommendation to the Supervisory Body may be delayed accordingly. If the proponent does not respond accordingly within 90 days, the submission shall be considered withdrawn.
27. If the methodological expert panel’s draft recommendation to the Supervisory Body is to approve the proposed new methodology or methodological tool, the secretariat shall communicate a reformatted new 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 methodological expert panel, confirm that the reformatted new methodology or methodological tool is acceptable or request modifications to it, in order that the methodological expert panel can finalize a recommendation to the Supervisory Body by the end of the meeting. If the proponent does not respond by this deadline, the panel's submission of a final recommendation to the Supervisory Body may be delayed accordingly.

28. The methodological expert panel shall finalize the recommendation to the Supervisory Body, 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 Supervisory Body on the agenda of the next Supervisory Body meeting.

5.1.6. Consideration by the Supervisory Body

29. At the Supervisory Body meeting for which the recommendation to the Supervisory Body from the methodological expert panel is placed on the agenda, the Supervisory Body shall decide whether to:
- (a) Approve the proposed new methodology or methodological tool as recommended by the methodological expert panel;
 - (b) Reject the proposed new methodology or methodological tool; or
 - (c) Request the methodological expert panel to review the recommendation to the Supervisory Body and provide guidance to the methodological expert panel on the issues to be reviewed.
30. If the Supervisory Body approves the proposed new methodology or methodological tool, the secretariat shall publish the approved new methodology or methodological tool on the UNFCCC 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 or methodological tools deemed qualified for consideration by the methodological panel and the Supervisory Body, indicating the current status in the process.
32. At any step before the Supervisory Body makes a final decision, the secretariat may request the proponent to provide additional information regarding the proposed new methodology or methodological tool within a defined time frame to facilitate the assessment by the secretariat and/or the consideration by the methodological expert panel and/or the Supervisory Body. If such information significantly affects the outcome of the assessment/consideration, the secretariat shall make the information publicly available on the UNFCCC website.

5.2. Top-down process

5.2.1. Initiation

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

consider prioritizing the development of a new methodology or methodological tool according to the following types:

- (a) Methodologies or methodological tools that are particularly useful for host Parties that are least developed countries and small island developing States as a means to meet the requirement in paragraph 29 of the RMPs, subject to availability of resources;
 - (b) Methodologies or methodological tools applicable to PoAs, particularly for the PoAs that contribute to the sustainable development of the host Parties and that facilitate the involvement of small and micro businesses, taking into account the request from the CMA in paragraph 5(g) of decision 3/CMA.3; and
 - (c) Methodologies or methodological tools that promote transformative climate action at the global scale.
34. The methodological expert panel, or the secretariat may propose to the Supervisory Body that it develop a new methodology (including a new consolidated methodology) or methodological tool at any time. In this case, the Supervisory Body 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 Supervisory Body 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” , 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 methodological expert panel 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 methodological expert panel, 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” 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 20 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. In preparing the draft new methodology or methodological tool, the secretariat and the selected members of the methodological expert panel may consult with the relevant working group referred to in paragraph 20 above.

41. The secretariat shall forward the draft new methodology or methodological tool to the selected members of the methodological expert panel for their review. The selected members shall provide input on the draft new methodology or methodological tool within five days of receipt of it.
42. The secretariat shall finalize the draft new methodology or methodological tool, taking into account the input from the selected members of the methodological expert panel and the relevant working group, and submit it to the methodological expert panel for consideration at its meeting at the latest seven days before the meeting.

5.2.3. Consideration by methodological expert panel

43. The methodological expert panel shall consider the draft new methodology or methodological tool and prepare a draft recommendation to the Supervisory Body on the draft new methodology or methodological tool.
44. The secretariat shall make the draft recommendation to the Supervisory Body publicly available on the UNFCCC 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 website.
45. The methodological expert panel shall finalize the recommendation to the Supervisory Body 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 Supervisory Body on the agenda of the next Supervisory Body meeting.

5.2.4. Consideration by the Supervisory Body

46. At the Supervisory Body meeting for which the recommendation to the Supervisory Body from the methodological expert panel is placed on the agenda, the Supervisory Body 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 methodological expert panel to review the recommendation to the Supervisory Body and provide guidance to the methodological expert panel on the issues to be reviewed.
47. If the Supervisory Body approves the proposed new methodology or methodological tool, the secretariat shall publish the approved new methodology or methodological tool on the UNFCCC website within seven days of the approval.
48. If the Supervisory Body approves the proposed new methodological tool, it shall request the methodological expert panel to prepare draft revised methodologies to introduce references to the new methodological tool in them, based on the list in the

recommendation from the methodological expert panel referred to in paragraph 45 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

49. The secretariat shall publish the schedules of the meetings of the methodological expert panel and the deadlines for the submission of requests for revision of an approved methodology or methodological tool to be considered by the methodological expert panel at the corresponding meeting. The methodological expert panel shall make every effort to initiate the consideration of the requests submitted on time at the meeting taking into account the priorities set by the chair of the methodological expert panel for that meeting.
50. The project participants of a planned project, the coordinating/managing entity of a planned PoA, a host Party, a DOE 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 Supervisory Body to revise an approved methodology or methodological tool by submitting the following documents to the secretariat through a specific interface on the UNFCCC website:
- (a) The completed “Form: Approved baseline and monitoring methodology/methodological tool revision request” ;
 - (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 project 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 methodological expert panel at a later stage to facilitate its consideration in accordance with paragraph 67 below:
 - (i) For a planned project:
 - a. Description of the project;
 - b. Application of selected approved baseline and monitoring methodology;
 - c. Duration and crediting period;
 - (ii) For a planned 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 to the CPA.

51. 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 projects 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 projects 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

52. The secretariat shall conduct a completeness check of the submission within seven days of the deadline for submissions referred to in paragraph 49 above.

53. 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 and stop further processing of the submission.

54. 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 53 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

55. 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 revision request initial assessment” within 30 days of the deadline for submissions referred to in paragraph 49 above, to determine whether the submission qualifies for consideration by the methodological expert panel and the Supervisory Body.

56. 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 and stop further processing of the submission.

57. 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 56 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.
58. If the submission is concluded as qualified for consideration by the methodological expert panel and the Supervisory Body, the secretariat shall make the submission publicly available on the UNFCCC 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 website.

6.1.4. Preparation of draft recommendation

59. The secretariat shall prepare a draft recommendation to the methodological expert panel 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".
60. 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*.
61. 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 20 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.
62. The secretariat shall select two members of the methodological expert panel 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.
63. In preparing the draft recommendation, the secretariat and the selected members of the methodological expert panel may consult with the relevant working group referred to in paragraph 20 above.
64. The secretariat shall finalize the recommendation, taking into account the input from the selected members of the methodological expert panel and the relevant working group, and

submit it to the methodological expert panel for consideration at its meeting in accordance with paragraph 49 above, at the latest seven days before the meeting.

6.1.5. Consideration by methodological expert panel

65. The methodological expert panel shall consider the recommendation and prepare a draft recommendation to the Supervisory Body. The methodological expert panel shall make every effort to conclude its consideration and finalize the recommendation to the Supervisory Body within two consecutive meetings. The recommendation to the Supervisory Body 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”).
66. In preparing the draft recommendation to the Supervisory Body, the methodological expert panel 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.
67. In preparing the draft recommendation to the Supervisory Body, the methodological expert panel 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 methodological expert panel identifies issues in the proposed revised methodology or methodological tool that may be addressed with clarifications or modifications, the methodological expert panel shall request the secretariat to communicate the issues to the proponent (“B case”). 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’s submission of a final recommendation to the Supervisory Body may be delayed accordingly. If the proponent does not respond accordingly within 90 days, the submission shall be considered withdrawn.
68. If the methodological expert panel’s draft recommendation to the Supervisory Body 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 methodological expert panel, confirm that the reformatted revised methodology or methodological tool is acceptable or request modifications to it, in order that the methodological expert panel can finalize a recommendation to the Supervisory Body by the end of the meeting. If the proponent does not respond by this deadline, the panel’s submission of a final recommendation to the Supervisory Body may be delayed accordingly.
69. The methodological expert panel shall finalize the recommendation to the Supervisory Body, taking into account the proponent’s responses referred to in paragraphs 67 and 68 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 Supervisory Body on the agenda of the next Supervisory Body meeting.

6.1.6. Consideration by the Supervisory Body

70. At the Supervisory Body meeting for which the recommendation to the Supervisory Body from the methodological expert panel is placed on the agenda, the Supervisory Body shall decide to:
- (a) Approve the proposed revised methodology or methodological tool as recommended by the methodological expert panel, 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 methodological expert panel to review the recommendation to the Supervisory Body and provide guidance to the methodological expert panel on the issues to be reviewed.
71. If the Supervisory Body approves the proposed revised methodology or methodological tool, the secretariat shall publish the approved revised methodology or methodological tool on the UNFCCC website within seven days of the approval.
72. If the Supervisory Body approves the proposed revised methodological tool, it shall request the methodological expert panel 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 methodological expert panel referred to in paragraph 69 above, following the process referred to in sections 6.2.2–6.2.4 below.

6.1.7. Other

73. 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 methodological expert panel and the Supervisory Body, indicating the current status in the process.
74. At any step before the Supervisory Body 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 methodological expert panel and/or the Supervisory Body. If such information significantly affects the outcome of the assessment/consideration, the secretariat shall make the information publicly available on the UNFCCC website.

6.2. Top-down process

6.2.1. Initiation

75. The Supervisory Body 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. The Supervisory Body may consider prioritizing the revision of an approved methodology or methodological tool according to the following types:
- (a) Methodologies or methodological tools that are particularly useful for host Parties that are least developed countries and small island developing States as a means to meet the requirement in paragraph 29 of the RMPs, subject to availability of resources;
 - (b) Methodologies or methodological tools applicable to PoAs, particularly for the PoAs that contribute to the sustainable development of the host Parties and that facilitate the involvement of small and micro businesses, taking into account the request from the CMA in paragraph 5(g) of decision 3/CMA.3; and
 - (c) Methodologies or methodological tools that promote transformative climate action at the global scale.
76. In this case, the Supervisory Body 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 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 or PoA applying the methodology or methodological tool from the day following the date of publication of the Supervisory Body'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 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 or PoA, applying the methodology or methodological tool any more than 28 days following the date of publication of the Supervisory Body'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 92–94 below.

77. The methodological expert panel, or the secretariat, may, taking into account the appendix to this procedure, propose that the Supervisory Body revise an approved methodology (including an approved consolidated methodology) or methodological tool at any time. If the methodological expert panel 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 Supervisory Body. In these cases, the Supervisory Body 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 75 above.
78. Notwithstanding paragraph 77 above, if a member of the methodological expert panel, 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 methodological expert panel may decide to directly initiate the revision.

6.2.2. Preparation of draft revised methodology or methodological tool

79. If the Supervisory Body decides to revise an approved methodology or methodological tool in accordance with paragraph 76 or 77 above, or the chair and the vice-chair of the methodological expert panel decide to revise it in accordance with paragraph 78 above, the secretariat shall prepare a draft revised methodology or methodological tool.
80. 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 20 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.
81. The secretariat shall select two members of the methodological expert panel 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.
82. In preparing the draft revised methodology or methodological tool, the secretariat and the selected members of the methodological expert panel may consult with the relevant working group referred to in paragraph 20 above.
83. The secretariat shall finalize the draft revised methodology or methodological tool, taking into account the input from the selected members of the methodological expert panel and the relevant working group, and submit it to the methodological expert panel for consideration at its meeting, at the latest seven days before the meeting.

6.2.3. Consideration by methodological expert panel

84. The methodological expert panel shall consider the draft revised methodology or methodological tool and prepare a draft recommendation to the Supervisory Body on the draft revised methodology or methodological tool.
85. The secretariat shall make the draft recommendation to the Supervisory Body publicly available on the UNFCCC 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 website. If the revision of an approved methodology or methodological tool has been initiated in accordance with paragraph 48, 72, 78 above, or 89 below, global stakeholder consultation is not necessary.

86. The methodological expert panel shall finalize the recommendation to the Supervisory Body 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 Supervisory Body on the agenda of the next Supervisory Body meeting.

6.2.4. Consideration by the Supervisory Body

87. At the Supervisory Body meeting for which the recommendation to the Supervisory Body from the methodological expert panel is placed on the agenda, the Supervisory Body 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 methodological expert panel to review the recommendation to the Supervisory Body and provide guidance to the methodological expert panel on the issues to be reviewed.
88. If the Supervisory Body approves the proposed revised methodology or methodological tool, the secretariat shall publish the approved revised methodology or methodological tool on the UNFCCC website within seven days of the approval.
89. If the Supervisory Body approves the proposed revised methodological tool, it shall request the methodological expert panel 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 methodological expert panel referred to in paragraph 86 above, following the process referred to in sections 6.2.2–6.2.4 above.

6.2.5. Other

90. 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 methodological expert panel 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 website. The editorial revision shall be noted in the next meeting report of the Supervisory Body.

7. Validity of new, revised and previous versions

91. An approved new or revised methodology or methodological tool shall be effective from the date of publication on the UNFCCC website. From this date, a project 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 “Procedure: Article 6.4 mechanism activity cycle.”
92. If the Supervisory Body approves a revised methodology or methodological tool indicating that it is a major revision in accordance with paragraph 70(a)(i) or 87(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 Supervisory Body in accordance with paragraph 75(a) or 75(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 “Procedure: Article 6.4 mechanism activity cycle”:
- (a) A project or PoA may still apply the previous version during this 240-day period unless the previous version has been put on hold by the Supervisory Body in accordance with paragraph 75(a) or 75(b) above; and
 - (b) A project 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 75(a) or 75(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 Supervisory Body when it approves the revised methodology or methodological tool.
93. If the Supervisory Body approves a revised methodology or methodological tool indicating that it is a minor revision in accordance with paragraph 70(a)(ii) or 87(a)(ii) above, or if an editorial revision to an approved methodology or methodological tool has been made in accordance with paragraph 90 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 “Procedure: Article 6.4 mechanism activity cycle”, 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.
94. If the Supervisory Body 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 Supervisory Body in accordance with paragraph 75(a) or 75(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 “Procedure: Article 6.4 mechanism activity cycle”:

- (a) A project 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 Supervisory Body in accordance with paragraph 75(a) or 75(b) above; and
 - (b) A project 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 75(a) or 75(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 Supervisory Body when it approves the revised methodology or methodological tool.
95. For the purpose of publication of a monitoring report and submission of a request for issuance, a project or PoA shall apply the version of the methodology or methodological tool that the project 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 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 Supervisory Body prior to the submission of the request for issuance in accordance with the relevant provisions of the “Procedure: Article 6.4 mechanism activity cycle”.
96. The revision of an approved methodology or methodological tool or the consolidation of methodologies or methodological tools shall not affect registered projects 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 or PoA expires.

8. Clarification of approved methodology or methodological tool

8.1. Bottom-up process

8.1.1. Submission of request for clarification

97. The secretariat shall publish the schedules of the meetings of the methodological expert panel and the deadlines for the submission of requests for clarification of an approved methodology or methodological tool to be considered by the methodological expert panel at the corresponding meeting. The methodological expert panel shall make every effort to initiate the consideration of the requests submitted on time at the meeting, taking into account the priorities set by the chair of the methodological expert panel for that meeting.

98. The project participants of a planned project or PoA, the coordinating/managing entity of a planned PoA, a host Party, a DOE 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 website, the duly completed “Form: Approved baseline and monitoring methodology/methodological tool clarification request” to the secretariat.

8.1.2. Completeness check

99. The secretariat shall conduct a completeness check of the submission within seven days of the deadline for submissions referred to in paragraph 97 above.

100. 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 and stop further processing of the submission.

101. 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 100 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

102. 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” within 15 days of the deadline for submissions referred to in paragraph 97 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

103. If the submission is determined as being the case referred to in paragraph 102(a) above, the secretariat shall prepare a clarification using the “Form: Approved baseline and monitoring methodology/methodological tool clarification response” and send it to the enquirer within 30 days of the deadline for submissions referred to in paragraph 97 above.

104. In preparing the clarification, the secretariat may consult with the methodological expert panel. In this case, the timeline referred in paragraph 103 above shall not apply. The secretariat shall send a draft clarification to the methodological expert panel within 30 days of the deadline for submissions referred to in paragraph 97 above. If no member of the

methodological expert panel objects to the draft clarification within seven days of receipt of the draft clarification, the clarification shall be deemed finalized by the methodological expert panel. If a member of the methodological expert panel objects to the draft clarification, the case shall be placed on the agenda of the next meeting of the methodological expert panel and be treated under the regular track from the step referred to in paragraph 108 below. At the meeting where the case is placed on the agenda, the methodological expert panel shall make every effort to finalize the clarification within one meeting.

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

8.1.5. Regular track

106. If the submission is determined as being the case referred to in paragraph 102(b) above, the secretariat shall prepare a draft recommendation of a clarification to the methodological expert panel using the “Form: Approved baseline and monitoring methodology/methodological tool clarification response” .
107. 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 20 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.
108. The secretariat shall select one member of the methodological expert panel 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.
109. In preparing the draft recommendation, the secretariat and the selected members of the methodological expert panel may consult with the relevant working group referred to in paragraph 20 above.
110. The secretariat shall finalize the recommendation, taking into account the input from the selected member, and submit it to the methodological expert panel and the relevant working group for consideration at its meeting in accordance with paragraph 97 above, at the latest seven days before the meeting.
111. The methodological expert panel shall consider the recommendation, finalize the recommendation and forward it to the Supervisory Body and publish it in its corresponding meeting report. The methodological expert panel shall make every effort to finalize the recommendation within one meeting.
112. If no member of the Supervisory Body objects to the recommendation above within 28 days of receipt of the recommendation, the recommended course of action shall be deemed to be the decision adopted by the Supervisory Body.
113. An objection by a member of the Supervisory Body shall be made by notifying the Chair of the Supervisory Body through the secretariat, giving reasons in writing. The secretariat shall acknowledge receipt of the objection and make it available to the Supervisory Body.
114. If a member of the Supervisory Body objects to the recommendation more than 14 days prior to the next Supervisory Body meeting, the case shall be placed on the agenda of the

next Supervisory Body meeting; otherwise it shall be placed on the agenda of the Supervisory Body meeting after that one.

115. At the Supervisory Body meeting for which the recommendation to the Supervisory Body is placed on the agenda, the Supervisory Body 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 methodological expert panel to review the recommendation to the Supervisory Body and provide guidance to the methodological expert panel on the issues to be reviewed.
116. If the Supervisory Body approves the clarification, the secretariat shall send the finalized clarification to the enquirer.
117. The secretariat shall publish the clarification on the UNFCCC website.

8.1.6. Other

118. 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 99–101 above, indicating the current status in the process.
119. At any step before the clarification is finalized in accordance with paragraph 103, 104 or 115(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 methodological expert panel. If such information significantly affects the outcome of the consideration, the secretariat shall make the information publicly available on the UNFCCC website.

8.2. Top-down process

120. If the Supervisory Body, the methodological expert panel 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 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 or PoA but the project or PoA is broadly similar to the project or PoAs to which the approved methodology is applicable. Similarity is based on the nature (technology/measure) of the project or PoA and the sources of the emissions affected by the project or PoA. For example, an approved methodology may not be applicable as the sources of emissions affected by the project are the same as those in the methodology but the technology/measure used in the project 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.

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 projects 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 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) project 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

<i>Version</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
01.0	17 May 2023	Published as an annex to the annotated agenda of SB 005.

Decision Class: Regulatory
Document Type: Procedure
Business Function: Methodology
Keywords: Article 6.4 mechanism, approving methodologies and tools, revising or withdrawing methodologies and tools, regulatory framework
