

**A6.4-SB006-AA-A06**

## Draft Procedure

---

Development, revision, clarification and  
update of standardized baselines

Version 02.1

DRAFT



## 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”,<sup>1</sup> 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. The Supervisory Body, at its fifth meeting, considered the draft procedure “Development, revision, clarification and update of standardized baseline development (version 01.0),”<sup>2</sup> and requested the secretariat to update the draft procedure, incorporating the feedback received at the meeting, for consideration at the sixth meeting of the Supervisory Body (SB 006, 10–13 July 2023).

### 2. Purpose

3. The purpose of this document is to define processes for the development of standardized baselines for consideration by the Supervisory Body.

### 3. Key issues and proposed solutions

4. The following guidance was provided by the Supervisory Body at its fourth meeting:<sup>3</sup>
  - (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;

---

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

<sup>2</sup> As contained in document A6.4-SB005-AA-A06 available at:  
<https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/a64-sb005-aa-a06.pdf>.

<sup>3</sup> As contained in document A6.4-SB004 paragraph 19 available at:  
<https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/a64-sb004.pdf>.

- (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 include other simplified fast-track approaches in the future after more experience is gained.
5. At its fifth meeting, the Supervisory Body provided further guidance as follows:<sup>4</sup>
- (a) Options for and facilitation of preparation of assessment report by a designated operational entity (DOE);
  - (b) Technical support to designated national authorities through capacity-building for development of standardized baselines;
  - (c) Types and examples of standardized baselines;
  - (d) Criteria for the prioritization of development of standardized baselines;
  - (e) Development of further guidance on standardized baselines for a group of Parties.
6. The draft procedure was developed taking into account the aforementioned guidance. The key changes proposed, compared to the corresponding procedure under the clean development mechanism (CDM), are as follows:
- (a) **Consultation with the relevant working group:** In preparing the draft recommendation (bottom-up cases) or the draft standardized baseline (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 the 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;
  - (b) **Prioritization of standardized baselines:** It is proposed that the Supervisory Body may consider prioritizing the development or approval of standardized baselines, based on factors such as relevance to least developed countries and small island developing States, host country priorities communicated to the Supervisory Body, potential for transformative climate action at a global or regional scale, potential for programmatic approaches, and the participation of small and micro businesses.
  - (c) **Development of standardized baselines for a group of Parties:** The procedure for the development of standardized baselines for a group of Parties is currently not covered in this document; it will be approved by the Supervisory Body in the future;
  - (d) **Speedy consultation on clarifications:** It is recommended that the Supervisory Body consider clarifications processed under regular track through electronic consultation. Only if at least one Supervisory Body member or alternate member

---

<sup>4</sup> As contained in document A6.4-SB005 paragraph 16 available at: <https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/a64-sb005.pdf>.

requests further discussion at a Supervisory Body meeting will such a case be considered at the next meeting. Otherwise, the clarification is deemed adopted.;

- (e) **Preparation of assessment report:** Under the CDM, proponents of a proposed standardized baseline are required to provide an assessment report prepared by a DOE. Designated national authorities of the host Parties for which standardized baselines were developed have faced difficulties related to financial resources and lengthy procedures or timelines for procuring the services of DOEs. In accordance with the recent decision by the CDM Executive Board, the proposed procedure permits the preparation of an assessment report by a DOE with funding support, following the modalities described in appendix 1 of this procedure.

#### **4. Impacts**

7. 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, DOEs 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**

8. Upon adoption of the procedure by the Supervisory Body, the secretariat will:
- (a) Publish it as a regulatory document on the UNFCCC website;
  - (b) Develop the draft terms of reference for the Methodological Expert Panel, for consideration by the Supervisory Body at its future meeting in 2023. The process to establish the Methodological Expert Panel, drawing on the existing roster of experts, should also be considered by the Supervisory Body;
  - (c) Prepare forms for submitting methodological requests;
  - (d) Develop a web interface and IT workflow for the submission and processing of methodological requests, aiming for operationalization on 01 February 2024.

#### **6. Recommendations to the Supervisory Body**

9. The secretariat recommends that the Supervisory Body adopt the procedure contained in this document, with the provision that it be made effective on 01 February 2024 so that mechanism methodologies and methodological tools and standardized baselines may be developed in accordance with the requirements for the development and assessment of mechanism methodologies that are expected to be adopted by the CMA at its fifth session.
10. This will allow sufficient time for the secretariat to make necessary arrangements (e.g., forms and a web interface and workflow for the submission and processing of methodological requests) as well as for the Supervisory Body to establish the Methodological Expert Panel.

---

<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b>	<b>Page</b>
<b>1. INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>2. SCOPE, APPLICABILITY AND ENTRY INTO FORCE .....</b>	<b>6</b>
2.1. Scope.....	6
2.2. Applicability.....	6
2.3. Entry into force.....	6
<b>3. NORMATIVE REFERENCES.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>4. DEFINITIONS .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>5. DEVELOPMENT OF A STANDARDIZED BASELINE.....</b>	<b>7</b>
5.1. Approaches to develop a standardized baseline .....	7
5.2. Bottom-up process.....	7
5.3. Top-down process .....	14
<b>6. REVISION OF A STANDARDIZED BASELINE.....</b>	<b>18</b>
6.1. Bottom-up process.....	18
6.2. Top-down process .....	23
<b>7. CLARIFICATION OF A STANDARDIZED BASELINE .....</b>	<b>27</b>
7.1. Bottom-up process.....	27
7.2. Top-down process .....	30
<b>8. UPDATE OF A STANDARDIZED BASELINE .....</b>	<b>30</b>
8.1. Bottom-up process.....	30
<b>9. VALIDITY OF NEW, UPDATED AND REVISED STANDARDIZED     BASELINES .....</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>APPENDIX 1. FUNDING MODALITIES FOR THE PREPARATION OF     ASSESSMENT REPORTS FOR ESTABLISHING     STANDARDIZED BASELINES.....</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>APPENDIX 2. PRINCIPLES FOR THE REVISION AND CLARIFICATION OF     STANDARDIZED BASELINES.....</b>	<b>39</b>

## 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).<sup>1</sup> 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,<sup>2</sup> with the aim to complete the process by 2023.

## 2. Scope, applicability and entry into force

### 2.1. Scope

3. The “Procedure: Development, revision, clarification and update of standardized baselines” (hereinafter referred to as this procedure) defines the process for the development of new standardized baselines as well as for revising, clarifying, and updating approved standardized baselines.

### 2.2. Applicability

4. This procedure applies to standardized baselines that may be applied for an Article 6.4 mechanism project or programme of activities (PoA).
5. A standardized baseline may also be developed for a group of Parties. The procedure for the development of standardized baselines for a group of Parties is currently not covered in this document; it will be approved by the Supervisory Body in the future.
6. This procedure does not contain the process to develop or revise a baseline and monitoring methodology or methodological tool for the purpose of developing a proposed standardized baseline, or for using the baseline and monitoring methodology together with a proposed standardized baseline to estimate emission reductions.

### 2.3. Entry into force

7. Version 01.0 of this procedure enters into force on DD Month YYYY.

## 3. Normative references

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

---

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

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

- (a) "Procedure: Activity cycle procedure for project activities" or "Procedure: Activity cycle procedure for programmes of activities";
- (b) "Guideline: Quality assurance and quality control of data used in the establishment of standardized baselines";
- (c) "Standard: Determining coverage of data and validity of standardized baselines";
- (d) "Procedure: Development, revision and clarification of baseline and monitoring methodologies and methodological tools".

## 4. Definitions

9. 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;
- (d) "Proponent" is a Party, activity participant, international industry organization or admitted observer organization.

## 5. Development of a standardized baseline

### 5.1. Approaches to develop a standardized baseline

10. A standardized baseline shall be developed using one of the following approaches:

- (a) A methodological approach contained in an approved, proposed new or revised baseline and monitoring methodology;
- (b) A methodological approach contained in an approved, proposed new or revised methodological tool; or
- (c) The approach in the other relevant methodological standards and guidelines adopted by the Supervisory Body<sup>3</sup>.

### 5.2. Bottom-up process

#### 5.2.1. Submission of a proposed standardized baseline

11. It is the prerogative of the designated national authority (DNA) to propose a standardized baseline. If an activity participant, an international industry organization, or an admitted observer organization wishes to submit a standardized baseline, it shall contact the DNA of the Party for which the standardized baseline is proposed. In doing so, the proponent

---

<sup>3</sup> The Supervisory Body may develop further guidance on how to develop a standardized baseline based on other approaches (e.g., a standardized baseline to address leakage or a standardized baseline to determine the best available technology at a country level.)

shall ensure that the proposed standardized baseline complies<sup>4</sup> with the “Standard: Determining coverage of data and validity of standardized baselines,” including the requirements related to the data coverage period, data currentness, and the validity<sup>5</sup> of standardized baselines. The DNA should subsequently submit the proposed standardized baseline to the secretariat in accordance with paragraphs 14–17 below.

12. Notwithstanding the provision in paragraph 10 above, if the proponent wishes to use a combination of the approaches for the development of the proposed standardized baseline, or deviate from the selected approach due to a specific issue of the sector or geographical area (e.g. country or region),<sup>6</sup> the proponent shall provide a justification for the necessity and the appropriateness of such combination or deviation in the submission of the proposed standardized baseline. In case of deviation from the approach referred to in paragraphs 10(a) or 10(b) above, the proponent shall also justify why a revision of the approved methodology or methodological tool is not necessary.
13. If the proponent wishes to use a new or revised approach to be contained in a methodology or methodological tool in accordance with paragraphs 10(a) or 10(b) above, or if there is no approved methodology available to be used together with the proposed standardized baseline to estimate emission reductions, it shall, through the DNA of the Party for which the standardized baseline is proposed, request approval from the Supervisory Body of a new or revised methodology or methodological tool in accordance with the “Procedure: Development, revision and clarification of baseline and monitoring methodologies and methodological tools”, through one of the following processes:
  - (a) Propose a new or revised methodology or methodological tool through the bottom-up process.<sup>7</sup> In this case, this proposal of a new or revised methodology or methodological tool shall be referred to in the submission of the proposed standardized baseline; or
  - (b) Request the secretariat to propose to the Supervisory Body the top-down development of a new methodology or methodological tool or the top-down revision of an approved methodology or methodological tool. In this case, this request shall be referred to in the submission of the proposed standardized baseline.

---

<sup>4</sup> Deviations from the requirements in the standard may be proposed with due justification, when proposing a new standardized baseline.

<sup>5</sup> An alternative length of the validity of a standardized baseline compared to the default validity of three years may be proposed in accordance with the “Standard: Determining coverage of data and validity of standardized baselines”.

<sup>6</sup> The following are examples of specific issues of the sector or geographical area: (i) the data available for the development of a proposed standardized baseline have a different vintage than that required by the approved approach(es); (ii) the default values of baseline and additionality threshold per the “Guideline for establishment of sector specific standardized baselines” are not applicable in their sector-specific context and therefore a different value(s) of the threshold is justified.

<sup>7</sup> The proposed new or revised methodology or methodological tool for the purpose of developing a proposed standardized baseline, or the proposed new or revised methodology or methodological tool that will be used together with the proposed standardized baseline, may be submitted to the secretariat at the same time with the proposed standardized baseline in accordance with the “Procedure: development, revision and clarification of baseline and monitoring methodologies and methodological tools”.



14. The DNA submitting the proposed standardized baseline shall submit the following documentation to the secretariat through a specified e-mail account made available on the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) website:
- (a) The completed “Form: Proposed standardized baseline submission”;
  - (b) A spreadsheet<sup>8</sup> containing all data used and the calculations performed for the establishment of the standardized baseline;
  - (c) A quality control report prepared in accordance with the “Guideline: Quality assurance and quality control of data used in the establishment of standardized baselines”;
  - (d) An assessment report prepared in accordance with paragraphs 15, 16 and 17 below;
  - (e) All additional documentation supporting the submission (e.g. statistics and/or, studies etc.), where applicable;
  - (f) Letter of approval on the proposed standardized baseline from the DNA.
15. In cases where no data collection/processing is required to establish the proposed standardized baseline<sup>9</sup>:
- (a) The documentation referred to in paragraphs 14(b)–14(c) above are not required to be submitted;
  - (a) The assessment report, referred to in paragraph 14(d) above, does not need to cover the quality assurance and quality control system referred to in paragraph 17(a) below. Consequently, the assessment report only needs to include an assessment of the compliance of the proposed standardized baseline with one of the approaches referred to in 17(b) below.
16. The assessment report referred to in paragraph 14(d) above may be prepared by a designated operational entity (DOE) contracted and paid for by either the DNA or any other entity under the agreement with the DNA. Alternatively, an assessment report may be prepared by a DOE with funding support in accordance with the modalities described in appendix 1 of this procedure.
17. The assessment report shall include a positive assessment opinion:
- (a) On the compliance of the quality assurance and quality control system with the provisions and data quality objectives of the “Guideline: Quality assurance and quality control of data in the establishment of standardized baselines”;
  - (b) That the proposed standardized baseline meets the requirements of:
    - (i) One of the approaches referred to in paragraph 10 above;

---

<sup>8</sup> In an accessible and verifiable (unprotected) format.

<sup>9</sup> Such cases are standardized baselines developed based only on existence of or lack of a policy/regulation. For example, since a standardized baseline for landfill gas destruction developed in accordance with the “Standard: Establishment of sector specific standardized baselines” requires information only on regulations on the mandatory destruction level, no data collection/processing is required.

- (ii) A proposed combination of the approaches referred to in paragraph 10 above; or
- (iii) One of the approaches referred to in paragraph 10 above with a proposed deviation from the approach.<sup>10</sup>

18. No fee shall be payable to the secretariat for the submission of the proposed standardized baseline.

### 5.2.2. Initial assessment

19. The secretariat shall undertake an initial assessment of the submission using the “Form: Proposed standardized baseline initial assessment” within 21 days of receipt of the submission to determine whether:

- (a) The DNA submitted all the documentation in accordance with paragraphs 14, 15 and 16;
- (b) The “Form: Proposed standardized baseline submission” has been completed, including the name and contact details of the proponent;
- (c) The proposed standardized baseline was derived from one of the approaches referred to in paragraph 10 above;
- (d) Except for the cases where an assessment report is not submitted in accordance with paragraph 16, the assessment report includes the positive assessment opinion in accordance with paragraph 17 above.

20. The secretariat shall inform the DNA and the proponent of the outcome of the initial assessment. If the secretariat finds that the required documentation or information is incomplete, it shall notify the DNA and the proponent accordingly. In this case, the DNA should provide the missing documents or information within 42 days of the notification.

21. The secretariat shall conclude the initial assessment within 14 days of the receipt of missing documents or information and inform the DNA and the proponent of the conclusion of the initial assessment. If the DNA does not provide the missing documents or information within the deadline, the secretariat shall suspend processing the submission and ascertain from the DNA whether it wishes that the proposed standardized baseline to continue to be considered. The secretariat shall resume processing the submission as soon as it receives the missing documents or information. In any case, if the DNA does not provide the missing documents or information within one year of the initial notification, the submission shall be considered withdrawn.

22. Upon successful conclusion of the initial assessment, the secretariat shall assign a reference number to the proposed standardized baseline and make the submitted documentation publicly available on the UNFCCC website with the exception of information declared confidential and/or proprietary by the DNA. Aggregated data and information used to derive the standardized baseline shall not be considered confidential or proprietary.

---

<sup>10</sup> If the DOE assesses a proposed standardized baseline with a proposed deviation from an approved approach(es), the assessment of the proposed deviation is not required.

### 5.2.3. Preparation of a draft recommendation

23. Within 28 days of the successful conclusion of the initial assessment, the secretariat shall prepare a draft recommendation on the proposed standardized baseline using either:
- (a) The “Form: Proposed standardized baseline recommendation” for the recommended course of action referred to in paragraphs 24(a) or 24(c) below; or
  - (e) The “Form: Proposed standardized baseline submission” for the recommended course of action referred to in paragraph 24(b) below.
24. The secretariat shall include in its draft recommendation one of the following courses of action:
- (a) Approve the proposed standardized baseline;
  - (b) Request further input (e.g. additional information or modification to the submitted documentation) from the DNA and the proponent; or
  - (c) Not approve the proposed standardized baseline.
25. In preparing the draft recommendation, the secretariat may draw upon external expertise, depending on the technical complexity of the proposed standardized baseline and the availability of expertise in the secretariat, by selecting a maximum of two external experts from the Methodologies Roster of Experts. If the secretariat does not find suitable and available experts on the roster, it may use the services of experts not included on the roster.
26. The secretariat shall select two members of the Methodological Expert Panel<sup>11</sup> and forward its draft recommendation to them.
27. In preparing the draft recommendation, the secretariat and the selected members of the Methodological Expert Panel may consult with the relevant working group, which is comprised of 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).

### 5.2.4. Consideration by selected members from the Methodological Expert Panel

28. The two selected members of the Methodological Expert Panel shall, within seven days of receipt of the draft recommendation, independently assess the proposed standardized baseline and the draft recommendation and inform the secretariat of the outcome of their assessment.
29. If both of the selected members of the Methodological Expert Panel agree to the draft recommendation to approve or not to approve the proposed standardized baseline, the secretariat shall forward it as the recommendation to the Supervisory Body and make it publicly available on the UNFCCC website.

---

<sup>11</sup> The names, as well as current and past professional affiliations, of the members of the Methodological Expert Panel will be published on the UNFCCC website. Additionally, the terms of reference for the support structure of the Supervisory Body will elaborate on the principles and rules that apply to the Methodological Expert Panel, including provisions related to the code of conduct and conflict of interest. These terms of reference will be developed by the Supervisory Body.

30. If both of the selected members of the Methodological Expert Panel agree to the draft recommendation that the proposed standardized baseline requires further input from the DNA, the secretariat shall notify the DNA and the proponent accordingly using the “Form: Proposed standardized baseline submission”. The DNA should submit the requested input within 28 days of the notification. All the input shall be highlighted in the “Form: Proposed standardized baseline submission”. If the DNA submits input including new data, the DNA should submit a revised assessment report, as applicable, within the same deadline. If the DNA does not provide the requested input and a revised assessment report, as applicable, within the deadline, the secretariat shall suspend processing the submission and ascertain from the DNA whether it wishes that the proposed standardized baseline continue to be considered. The secretariat shall resume processing the submission as soon as it receives the requested input and a revised assessment report, as applicable. In any case, if the DNA does not provide the requested input and a revised assessment report, as applicable, within one year of the initial notification, the submission shall be considered withdrawn.
31. The secretariat shall assess the further input submitted by the DNA. If the secretariat finds that it is still not sufficient to recommend that the proposed standardized baseline be approved or not approved, the secretariat may initiate a direct communication with the DNA and the proponent via e-mail or conference calls to clarify remaining issues.
32. The secretariat shall revise the draft recommendation, taking into account the further input and direct communication with the DNA and the proponent, as applicable, to recommend that the proposed standardized baseline be either approved or not approved. The secretariat shall forward the revised draft recommendation to the two selected members of the Methodological Expert Panel for their consideration. In this case, the steps in paragraphs 29 above or 33–37 below shall follow.

#### **5.2.5. Consideration by the Methodological Expert Panel**

33. If at least one selected member of the Methodological Expert Panel disagrees with the draft recommendation or requests that it be considered by the Methodological Expert Panel, the secretariat shall forward the draft recommendation to the Methodological Expert Panel. The Methodological Expert Panel shall consider the proposed standardized baseline and the draft recommendation at its next meeting, provided it is received at least 14 days before the meeting; otherwise it shall be considered at the meeting after that one.
34. The Methodological Expert Panel shall finalize its consideration within two meetings, unless it finds that further input from the DNA or guidance from the Supervisory Body is required. In case further input from the DNA or guidance from the Supervisory Body is sought, the Methodological Expert Panel shall finalize its consideration at the meeting immediately following the receipt of such input or guidance. In finalizing its consideration, the Methodological Expert Panel shall conclude to recommend that the proposed standardized baseline be either approved or not approved. The secretariat shall forward it as the recommendation to the Supervisory Body and make it publicly available on the UNFCCC website.
35. If the Methodological Expert Panel finds that further input from the DNA is required, the secretariat shall notify the DNA and the proponent accordingly. In this case, the DNA should submit the requested input within 28 days of the notification. If the DNA does not submit the requested input within the deadline, the secretariat shall suspend processing the submission and ascertain from the DNA whether it wishes that the proposed standardized baseline continues to be considered. The secretariat shall resume processing the submission as soon as it receives the requested input. In any case, if the

DNA does not provide the requested input within one year of the initial notification, the submission shall be considered withdrawn.

36. The secretariat shall assess the further input submitted by the DNA. If the secretariat finds that the further input is still not sufficient to recommend that the proposed standardized baseline be approved or not approved, the secretariat may initiate a direct communication with the DNA and the proponent via e-mail or conference calls to clarify remaining issues.
37. The secretariat shall revise the draft recommendation, taking into account the further input and direct communication with the DNA and the proponent, as applicable, to recommend that the proposed standardized baseline be either approved or not approved. The secretariat shall forward the revised draft recommendation to the Methodological Expert Panel for its final consideration. The Methodological Expert Panel shall conclude to recommend that the proposed standardized baseline be either approved or not approved. The secretariat shall forward it as the recommendation to the Supervisory Body and make it publicly available on the UNFCCC website.

#### **5.2.6. Preparation of draft standardized baseline**

38. If the recommendation is to approve the proposed standardized baseline, before forwarding it to the Supervisory Body in accordance with paragraphs 29, 34 or 37 above, the secretariat shall:
  - (a) Reformat the proposed standardized baseline into the form of draft standardized baseline (DSB) and send it to the two selected Methodological Expert Panel members or to the Methodological Expert Panel, whichever considered the draft recommendation last. Upon receipt of an agreement on the DSB from the two selected Methodological Expert Panel members, or from the Methodological Expert Panel, as applicable, the secretariat shall communicate the DSB to the DNA and the proponent. The DNA shall confirm that it is acceptable or request modifications to it within seven days of receipt. If the DNA does not respond by this deadline, the forwarding of the recommendation to the Supervisory Body may be delayed accordingly. If the DNA does not accept the DSB and/or requests modification to it in its response, the secretariat shall forward the DSB and the response from the DNA to the two selected Methodological Expert Panel members, or to the Methodological Expert Panel, whichever considered the draft recommendation last. In this case, taking into account the response from the DNA, the two selected Methodological Expert Panel members shall finalize the DSB within seven days of receipt, or the Methodological Expert Panel shall finalize the DSB at its next meeting;
  - (b) Ensure that the proposed new or revised approach(es) to develop the proposed standardized baseline and/or the proposed new or revised methodology to be used together with the proposed standardized baseline to estimate emission reductions have been approved by the Supervisory Body, if they have been submitted to the secretariat in accordance with paragraph 13 above;

#### **5.2.7. Consideration by the Supervisory Body**

39. If no member of the Supervisory Body objects to the recommendation received in accordance with paragraphs 29, 34 or 37 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.

40. 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.
41. 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.
42. If the Supervisory Body considers the case at its meeting, it shall decide on one of the following courses of action at the meeting:
  - (a) Approve the DSB;
  - (a) Not approve the DSB;
  - (b) Continue the consideration of the DSB at the next Supervisory Body meeting; or
  - (c) Request the Methodological Expert Panel to review the recommendation and provide guidance on the issues for the review.
43. Once a decision has been made by the Supervisory Body, the secretariat shall inform the DNA and the proponent of the decision and any guidance provided by the Supervisory Body, as applicable, and make the decision and guidance publicly available on the UNFCCC website.
44. If the DSB is not approved, the DNA may at any time resubmit a proposed standardized baseline with revised documentation. Upon submission of the revised documentation, the submission shall be treated as a new submission of a proposed standardized baseline.

### **5.3. Top-down process**

#### **5.3.1. Initiation**

45. The secretariat may propose to the Supervisory Body that the secretariat develop a DSB at any time following the receipt of an expression of interest from the DNA(s) of a Party(ies) for which the DSB will be proposed. The Supervisory Body shall consider the proposal and decide on one of the following courses of action:
  - (a) Approve the proposed development of the DSB including, if required during the course of the preparation of the DSB, the top-down development of, revision to, or deviation from:
    - (i) An approach to develop the DSB; and/or
    - (ii) A methodology to be used together with the DSB for the purpose of estimation of emission reductions;
  - (b) Not approve the proposed development of the DSB; or
  - (c) Continue the consideration of the proposed development of the DSB at the next Supervisory Body meeting.
46. The Supervisory Body may prioritize, as needed, the development or approval of a new standardized baseline, based on factors such as relevance for least developed countries and small island developing States, host country priorities communicated to the

Supervisory Body, potential for transformative climate action at a global or regional scale, potential for programmatic approaches, and participation of small and micro businesses.

### **5.3.2. Preparation of a draft standardized baseline**

47. If the Supervisory Body decides to develop a DSB in accordance with paragraph 45(a) above, the DNA shall submit the duly completed “Form: Draft standardized baseline development agreement” to the specified UNFCCC e-mail account made available on the UNFCCC website.
48. Upon receipt of the duly completed “Form: Draft standardized baseline development agreement”, the secretariat shall prepare a draft development plan of the DSB in consultation with the DNA using the “Form: Draft standardized baseline development plan”, defining, inter alia, the scope, applicability, approach(es), data collection process, data quality assurance process, necessity of a new or revised methodology or methodological tool, necessity of a deviation from the selected approach(es), and time frame for the development of the DSB.
49. 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.
50. 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.
51. The secretariat shall prepare the DSB in accordance with the development plan. In doing so, the secretariat shall ensure that the DSB complies with the “Standard: Determining coverage of data and validity of standardized baselines”, including the requirements related to the data coverage period, data currentness and the validity of standardized baselines.
52. In preparing the DSB, the secretariat may draw upon external expertise, depending on the technical complexity of the DSB and the availability of expertise in the secretariat, by selecting a maximum of two external experts from the Methodologies Roster of Experts. If the secretariat does not find suitable and available experts on the roster, it may use the services of experts not included on the roster.
53. The secretariat shall select two members of the Methodological Expert Panel and forward the DSB to them.
54. In preparing the DSB, the secretariat and the selected members of the Methodological Expert Panel may consult with the relevant working group referred to in paragraph 27 above.

### **5.3.3. Consideration by selected members of the Methodological Expert Panel**

55. The two selected members of the Methodological Expert Panel shall, within seven days of receipt of the DSB, independently assess the DSB and inform the secretariat of their recommendation, indicating one of the following courses of action:
  - (a) Approve the DSB;
  - (a) Request further input (e.g. additional information or modification to the submitted documentation) from the DNA; or

- (b) Request that the DSB be considered by the Methodological Expert Panel.
56. If both of the selected members of the Methodological Expert Panel recommend that the DSB be approved, the secretariat shall forward it to the Supervisory Body and make it publicly available on the UNFCCC website.
57. If both of the selected members of the Methodological Expert Panel recommend that the DSB requires further input from the DNA, the secretariat shall notify the DNA(s) accordingly. The DNA should submit the requested input within 28 days of the notification. If the DNA does not provide the requested input within the deadline, the secretariat shall suspend processing the development and ascertain from the DNA whether it wishes that the DSB continue to be developed. The secretariat shall resume developing the DSB as soon as it receives the requested input. In any case, if the DNA does not provide the requested input within one year of the initial notification, the secretariat shall terminate the development of the DSB.
58. The secretariat shall assess the further input submitted by the DNA. If the secretariat finds that it is still not sufficient to develop the DSB, the secretariat may initiate a direct communication with the DNA via e-mail or conference calls to clarify remaining issues.
59. The secretariat shall revise the DSB, taking into account the further input and direct communication with the DNA, as applicable. The secretariat shall forward the revised DSB to the two selected members of the Methodological Expert Panel for their consideration. In this case, the steps in paragraphs 56 above or 60–64 below shall follow.

#### **5.3.4. Consideration by the Methodological Expert Panel**

60. If at least one selected member of the Methodological Expert Panel requests that the DSB be considered by the Methodological Expert Panel, the secretariat shall forward the DSB to the Methodological Expert Panel. The Methodological Expert Panel shall consider the DSB at its next meeting, provided it is received at least 14 days before the meeting; otherwise it shall be considered at the meeting after that one.
61. The Methodological Expert Panel shall finalize the DSB within two meetings, unless it finds that further input from the DNA or guidance from the Supervisory Body is required. In case further input from the DNA or guidance from the Supervisory Body is sought, the Methodological Expert Panel shall finalize the DSB at the meeting immediately following receipt of such input or guidance. The secretariat shall forward it to the Supervisory Body and make it publicly available on the UNFCCC website.
62. If the Methodological Expert Panel finds that further input from the DNA is required, the secretariat shall notify the DNA accordingly. In this case, the DNA should submit the requested input within 28 days of the notification. If the DNA does not submit the requested input within the deadline, the secretariat shall suspend the development of the DSB and ascertain from the DNA whether it wishes that the DSB continue to be developed. The secretariat shall resume developing the DSB as soon as it receives the requested input. In any case, if the DNA does not provide the requested input within one year of the initial notification, the secretariat shall terminate the development of the DSB.
63. The secretariat shall assess the further input submitted by the DNA(s). If the secretariat finds that the further input is still not sufficient to develop the DSB, the secretariat may initiate a direct communication with the DNA(s) via e-mail or conference calls to clarify remaining issues.



64. The secretariat shall revise the DSB, taking into account the further input and direct communication with the DNA(s), as applicable. The secretariat shall forward the revised DSB to the Methodological Expert Panel for its final consideration. The Methodological Expert Panel shall finalize the DSB. The secretariat shall forward it to the Supervisory Body and make it publicly available on the UNFCCC website.

#### **5.3.5. Finalization of a draft standardized baseline**

65. Before forwarding the DSB to the Supervisory Body in accordance with paragraphs 56, 61 or 64 above, the secretariat shall communicate the DSB to the DNA. The DNA shall confirm that it is acceptable or request modifications to it within 14 days of receipt. If the DNA does not respond by this deadline, the forwarding of the DSB to the Supervisory Body may be delayed accordingly. If the DNA does not accept the DSB and/or requests modification to it in its response, the secretariat shall forward the DSB and the response from the DNA to the two selected Methodological Expert Panel members, or to the Methodological Expert Panel, whichever considered the DSB last. In this case, taking into account the response of the DNA, the two selected Methodological Expert Panel members shall finalize the DSB within seven days of receipt, or the Methodological Expert Panel shall finalize the DSB at its next meeting, as applicable.

#### **5.3.6. Consideration by the Supervisory Body**

66. If no member of the Supervisory Body objects to approving the DSB received in accordance with paragraphs 56, 61 or 64 above within 28 days of receipt of the DSB, the DSB shall be deemed to be approved by the Supervisory Body.
67. 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.
68. If a member of the Supervisory Body objects to approving the DSB 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.
69. If the Supervisory Body considers the case at its meeting, it shall decide on one of the following courses of action at the meeting:
- (a) Approve the DSB;
  - (b) Not approve the DSB;
  - (c) Continue the consideration of the DSB at the next Supervisory Body meeting; or
  - (d) Request the Methodological Expert Panel to review the DSB and provide guidance on the issues for the review.
70. Once a decision has been made by the Supervisory Body, the secretariat shall inform the DNA of the decision and any guidance provided by the Supervisory Body, as applicable, and make the decision and guidance publicly available on the UNFCCC website.

## 6. Revision of a standardized baseline

### 6.1. Bottom-up process

#### 6.1.1. Submission of proposed revised standardized baseline

71. A proponent may, taking into account the principles for revisions referred to in appendix to this procedure, propose a revision to an approved standardized baseline through the DNA of a Party for which the revised standardized baseline is proposed. In doing so, if new or additional data were used to establish the proposed revised standardized baseline, the proponent shall ensure that the new or additional data used in the proposed revised standardized baseline complies<sup>12</sup> with the “Standard: Determining coverage of data and validity of standardized baselines,” including the requirements related to the data coverage period and data currentness. The DNA should subsequently submit the proposed revised standardized baseline to the secretariat in accordance with paragraphs 72–74 below.
72. The DNA submitting the proposed revised standardized baseline shall submit the following documentation to the secretariat through a specified e-mail account made available on the UNFCCC website:
- (a) The completed “Form: Approved standardized baseline revision request”;
  - (b) The proposed revised standardized baseline, highlighting the proposed changes to the approved standardized baseline;
  - (c) A spreadsheet<sup>13</sup> containing all data used and the calculations performed for the establishment of the proposed revised standardized baseline;
  - (d) A quality control report prepared in accordance with the “Guideline: Quality assurance and quality control of data used in the establishment of standardized baselines”;
  - (e) An assessment report on the proposed revised standardized baseline containing the information referred to in paragraph 17 above and prepared in accordance with paragraph 73(b) below;
  - (f) All additional documentation supporting the submission (e.g. statistics and/or, studies etc.), where applicable;
  - (g) Letter of approval on the proposed revised standardized baseline from the DNA.
73. In cases where no new or additional data were required to establish the proposed revised standardized baseline:
- (a) The documentation referred to in paragraph 72(d) above is not required to be submitted;
  - (b) The assessment report referred to in paragraph 72(e) above does not need to include a positive assessment opinion on the compliance of the quality assurance and quality control system referred to in paragraph 17(a) above. Consequently, the

---

<sup>12</sup> Deviations from the requirements in the standard may be proposed with due justification when proposing a revision to an approved standardized baseline.

<sup>13</sup> In an accessible and verifiable (unprotected) format.

assessment report only needs to include a positive assessment opinion that the proposed standardized baseline meet the requirements of one of the approaches referred to in paragraph 17(b) above.

74. The assessment report referred to in paragraph 72(e) above may be prepared by a DOE contracted and paid for by either the DNA or any other entity under the agreement with the DNA. Alternatively, an assessment report may be prepared by a DOE with funding support in accordance with the modalities described in appendix 1 to this procedure.
75. No fee shall be payable to the secretariat for the submission of the proposed revised standardized baseline.

#### **6.1.2. Initial assessment**

76. The secretariat shall undertake an initial assessment of the submission using the “Form: Approved standardized baseline revision request initial assessment” within 21 days of receipt of the submission to determine whether:
  - (a) The DNA submitted all the documentation in accordance with paragraphs 72 and 73 above;
  - (b) The “Form: Approved standardized baseline revision request”, has been duly completed, including the name and contact details of the proponent;
  - (c) The proposed revised standardized baseline was derived from the same approach as the one used in the approved standardized baseline that is being proposed for revision;
  - (d) The assessment report includes a positive assessment opinion in accordance with paragraph 17 above.
77. The secretariat shall inform the DNA and the proponent of the outcome of the initial assessment. If the secretariat finds that the required documentation or information is incomplete, it shall notify the DNA and the proponent accordingly. In this case, the DNA should provide the missing documents or information within 42 days of the notification.
78. The secretariat shall conclude the initial assessment within 14 days of receipt of the missing documents or information and inform the DNA and the proponent of the conclusion of the initial assessment. If the DNA does not provide the missing documents or information within the deadline, the secretariat shall suspend processing the submission and ascertain from the DNA whether it wishes that the proposed revised standardized baseline continues to be considered. The secretariat shall resume processing the submission as soon as it receives the missing documents or information. In any case, if the DNA does not provide the missing documents or information within one year of the initial notification, the submission shall be considered withdrawn.
79. Upon successful conclusion of the initial assessment, the secretariat shall assign a reference number to the proposed revision and make the submitted documentation publicly available on the UNFCCC website with the exception of information declared confidential and/or proprietary by the DNA. Aggregated data and information used to derive the standardized baseline shall not be considered confidential or proprietary.

### 6.1.3. Preparation of a draft recommendation

80. Within 28 days of the successful conclusion of the initial assessment, the secretariat shall prepare a draft recommendation on the proposed revised standardized baseline using either:
- (a) The “Form: Approved standardized baseline revision recommendation” for the recommended course of action referred to in paragraphs 82(a) or 81(c) below; or
  - (b) The “Form: Approved standardized baseline revision request” for the recommended course of action referred to in paragraph 81(b) below.
81. The secretariat shall include in its draft recommendation one of the following courses of action:
- (a) Approve the proposed revised standardized baseline, indicating that:
    - (i) The revision is a major revision; or
    - (ii) The revision is a minor revision;
  - (b) Request further input (e.g. additional information or modification to the submitted documentation) from the DNA and the proponent; or
  - (c) Not approve the proposed revised standardized baseline.
82. In preparing the draft recommendation, the secretariat may draw upon external expertise, depending on the technical complexity of the proposed revised standardized baseline and the availability of expertise in the secretariat, by selecting a maximum of two external experts from the Methodologies Roster of Experts. If the secretariat does not find suitable and available experts on the roster, it may use the services of experts not included on the roster.
83. The secretariat shall select two members of the Methodological Expert Panel and forward its draft recommendation to them.
84. 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 27 above.

### 6.1.4. Consideration by selected members of the Methodological Expert Panel

85. The two selected members of the Methodological Expert Panel shall, within seven days of receipt of the draft recommendation, independently assess the proposed revised standardized baseline and the draft recommendation and inform the secretariat of the outcome of their assessment.
86. If both of the selected members of the Methodological Expert Panel agree to the draft recommendation that the proposed revised standardized baseline be approved indicating that the revision is major,<sup>14</sup> approved indicating that the revision is minor,<sup>15</sup> or not approved, the secretariat shall forward it as the recommendation to the Supervisory Body and make it publicly available on the UNFCCC website.

---

<sup>14</sup> See paragraph 181.

<sup>15</sup> See paragraph 184.

87. If both of the selected members of the Methodological Expert Panel agree to the draft recommendation that the proposed revised standardized baseline requires further input from the DNA, the secretariat shall notify the DNA and the proponent accordingly using the “Form: Approved standardized baseline revision request”. The DNA should submit the requested input within 28 days of the notification. All the input shall be highlighted in the “Form: Approved standardized baseline revision request form”. If the DNA does not provide the requested input within the deadline, the secretariat shall suspend processing the submission and ascertain from the DNA whether it wishes that the proposed revised standardized baseline continues to be considered. The secretariat shall resume processing the submission as soon as it receives the requested input. In any case, if the DNA does not provide the requested input within one year of the initial notification, the submission shall be considered withdrawn.
88. The secretariat shall assess the further input submitted by the DNA. If the secretariat finds that it is still not sufficient to recommend that the proposed revised standardized baseline be approved indicating that the revision is major or minor, or not approved, the secretariat may initiate a direct communication with the DNA and the proponent via e-mail or conference calls to clarify remaining issues.
89. The secretariat shall revise the draft recommendation, taking into account the further input and direct communication with the DNA and the proponent, as applicable, to recommend that the proposed revised standardized baseline be either approved indicating that the revision is major or minor, or not approved. The secretariat shall forward the revised draft recommendation to the two selected members of the Methodological Expert Panel for their consideration. In this case, the steps in paragraphs 86 above or 90–93 below shall follow.

#### **6.1.5. Consideration by the Methodological Expert Panel**

90. If at least one selected member of the Methodological Expert Panel disagrees with the draft recommendation or requests that it be considered by the Methodological Expert Panel, the secretariat shall forward the draft recommendation to the Methodological Expert Panel. The Methodological Expert Panel shall consider the proposed revised standardized baseline and the draft recommendation at its next meeting, provided it is received at least 14 days before the meeting; otherwise it shall be considered at the meeting after that one.
91. The Methodological Expert Panel shall finalize its consideration within two meetings, unless it finds that further input from the DNA or guidance from the Supervisory Body is required. In case further input from the DNA or guidance from the Supervisory Body is sought, the Methodological Expert Panel shall finalize its consideration at the meeting immediately following receipt of such input or guidance. In finalizing its consideration, the Methodological Expert Panel shall conclude to recommend that the proposed revised standardized baseline be either approved indicating that the revision is major or minor, or not approved. The secretariat shall forward it as the recommendation to the Supervisory Body and make it publicly available on the UNFCCC website.
92. If the Methodological Expert Panel finds that further input from the DNA is required, the secretariat shall notify the DNA and the proponent accordingly. In this case, the DNA should submit the requested input within 28 days of the notification. If the DNA does not submit the requested input within the deadline, the secretariat shall suspend processing the submission and ascertain from the DNA whether it wishes that the proposed revised standardized baseline continues to be considered. The secretariat shall resume processing the submission as soon as it receives the requested input. In any case, if the

DNA does not provide the requested input within one year of the initial notification, the submission shall be considered withdrawn.

93. The secretariat shall assess the further input submitted by the DNA. If the secretariat finds that the further input is still not sufficient to recommend that the proposed revised standardized baseline be approved indicating that the revision is major or minor, or not approved, the secretariat may initiate a direct communication with the DNA and the proponent via e-mail or conference calls to clarify remaining issues.
94. The secretariat shall revise the draft recommendation, taking into account the further input and direct communication with the DNA and the proponent, as applicable, to recommend that the proposed revised standardized baseline be either approved indicating that the revision is major or minor, or not approved. The secretariat shall forward the revised draft recommendation to the Methodological Expert Panel for its final consideration. The Methodological Expert Panel shall conclude to recommend that the proposed revised standardized baseline be either approved indicating that the revision is major or minor or not approved. The secretariat shall forward it as the recommendation to the Supervisory Body and make it publicly available on the UNFCCC website.

#### **6.1.6. Preparation of draft revised standardized baseline**

95. If the draft recommendation is to approve the proposed revised standardized baseline in accordance with paragraphs 86, 91 or 94 above, the secretariat shall, before forwarding it as the recommendation to the Supervisory Body, reformat the proposed revised standardized baseline and send it to the two selected Methodological Expert Panel members or to the Methodological Expert Panel, whichever considered it last. Upon receipt of an agreement on the reformatted revised standardized baseline from the two selected Methodological Expert Panel members, or from the Methodological Expert Panel, as applicable, the secretariat shall communicate the reformatted revised standardized baseline to the DNA and the proponent. The DNA shall confirm that it is acceptable or request modifications to it within seven days of receipt. If the DNA does not respond by this deadline, the forwarding of the recommendation to the Supervisory Body may be delayed accordingly. If the DNA does not accept the reformatted revised standardized baseline and/or requests modification to it in its response, the secretariat shall forward the reformatted revised standardized baseline and the response from the DNA to the two selected Methodological Expert Panel members, or to the Methodological Expert Panel, whichever considered the draft recommendation last. In this case, taking into account the response from the DNA, the two selected Methodological Expert Panel members shall finalize the reformatted revised standardized baseline within seven days of receipt, or the Methodological Expert Panel shall finalize the reformatted revised standardized baseline at its next meeting, as applicable.

#### **6.1.7. Consideration by the Supervisory Body**

96. If no member of the Supervisory Body objects to the recommendation received in accordance with paragraphs 86, 91 or 94 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.
97. 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.

98. 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.
99. If the Supervisory Body considers the case at its meeting, it shall decide on one of the following courses of action at the meeting:
- (a) Approve the proposed revised standardized baseline, indicating that:
    - (i) The revision is a major revision; or
    - (ii) The revision is a minor revision;
  - (b) Not approve the proposed revised standardized baseline;
  - (c) Continue the consideration of the proposed revised standardized baseline at the next Supervisory Body meeting; or
  - (d) Request the Methodological Expert Panel to review the recommendation and provide guidance on the issues for the review.
100. Once a decision has been made by the Supervisory Body, the secretariat shall inform the DNA and the proponent of the decision and any guidance provided by the Supervisory Body, as applicable, and make the decision and guidance publicly available on the UNFCCC website.
101. If the proposed revised standardized baseline is not approved, the DNA may at any time resubmit a proposed revised standardized baseline with revised documentation. Upon submission of the revised documentation, the submission shall be treated as a new submission of a proposed revised standardized baseline.

## **6.2. Top-down process**

### **6.2.1. Initiation**

102. The Supervisory Body may, taking into account the principles for revisions referred to in appendix to this procedure, decide to revise an approved standardized baseline at any time. If the Supervisory Body decides to revise an approved standardized baseline, the Supervisory Body shall also decide to:
- (a) Put on hold the approved standardized baseline with immediate effect. In this case, DOEs shall not submit, through a dedicated interface on the UNFCCC website, any project design document (PDD) or programme of activities design document (PoA-DD) for global stakeholder consultation, any request for registration or any request for renewal of the crediting period of a project or PoA applying the approved standardized baseline from the day following the date of publication of the Supervisory Body's meeting report containing the decision;
  - (b) Put on hold the approved standardized baseline 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 the crediting period of a project or PoA applying the approved standardized baseline 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 standardized baseline until the expiry of its validity in accordance with section 9 below.

103. The Methodological Expert Panel or the secretariat may at any time, taking into account the principles for revisions referred to in appendix to this procedure, propose that the Supervisory Body revise an approved standardized baseline. If the Methodological Expert Panel or the secretariat considers that the current version of the approved standardized baseline 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 approved standardized baseline in accordance with paragraph 102 above.

#### **6.2.2. Preparation of a draft revised standardized baseline**

104. If the Supervisory Body decides to revise an approved standardized baseline in accordance with paragraphs 102 or 103 above, the secretariat shall communicate the decision to the DNA of the Party for which a revised standardized baseline will be proposed and seek its agreement to the initiation of the revision. Following receipt of the agreement with the DNA using the “Form: Approved standardized baseline revision agreement”, the secretariat shall prepare a draft revised standardized baseline highlighting the proposed changes to the approved standardized baseline.

105. In preparing the draft revised standardized baseline, the secretariat may draw upon external expertise, depending on the technical complexity of the revision and the availability of expertise in the secretariat, by selecting a maximum of two external experts from the Methodologies Roster of Experts. If the secretariat does not find suitable and available experts on the roster, it may use the services of experts not included on the roster.

106. The secretariat shall select two members of the Methodological Expert Panel and forward the draft revised standardized baseline to them.

107. In preparing the draft revised standardized baselines, the secretariat and the selected members of the Methodological Expert Panel may consult with the relevant working group referred to in paragraph 27 above.

#### **6.2.3. Consideration by selected members of the Methodological Expert Panel**

108. The two selected members of the Methodological Expert Panel shall, within seven days of receipt of the draft revised standardized baseline, independently assess the draft revised standardized baseline and inform the secretariat of their recommendation indicating one of the following courses of action:

- (a) Approve the draft revised standardized baseline, indicating that:
  - (i) The revision is a major revision; or
  - (ii) The revision is a minor revision;
- (b) Request further input (e.g. additional information or modification to the submitted documentation) from the DNA; or
- (c) Request that the draft revised standardized baseline be considered by the Methodological Expert Panel.



109. If both of the selected members of the Methodological Expert Panel recommend that the draft revised standardized baseline be approved indicating that the revision is either major or minor, the secretariat shall forward it to the Supervisory Body and make it publicly available on the UNFCCC website.
110. If both of the selected members of the Methodological Expert Panel recommend that the draft revised standardized baseline requires further input from the DNA, the secretariat shall notify the DNA accordingly. The DNA should submit the requested input within 28 days of the notification. If the DNA does not provide the requested input within the deadline, the secretariat shall suspend processing the development and ascertain from the DNA whether it wishes that the draft revised standardized baseline continue to be developed. The secretariat shall resume development of the draft revised standardized baseline as soon as it receives the requested input. In any case, if the DNA does not provide the requested input within one year of the initial notification, the secretariat shall terminate the development of the draft revised standardized baseline.
111. The secretariat shall assess the further input submitted by the DNA. If the secretariat finds that it is still not sufficient to develop the draft revised standardized baseline, the secretariat may initiate a direct communication with the DNA via e-mail or conference calls to clarify remaining issues.
112. The secretariat shall revise the draft revised standardized baseline, taking into account the further input and direct communication with the DNA, as applicable. The secretariat shall forward the revised draft revised standardized baseline to the two selected members of the Methodological Expert Panel for their consideration. In this case, the steps in paragraphs 109 above or 113–117 below shall follow.

#### **6.2.4. Consideration by the Methodological Expert Panel**

113. If at least one selected member of the Methodological Expert Panel requests that the draft revised standardized baseline be considered by the Methodological Expert Panel, the secretariat shall forward the draft revised standardized baseline to the Methodological Expert Panel. The Methodological Expert Panel shall consider the draft revised standardized baseline at its next meeting, provided it is received at least 14 days before the meeting; otherwise it shall be considered at the Supervisory Body meeting after that one.
114. The Methodological Expert Panel shall finalize the draft revised standardized baseline within two meetings, unless it finds that further input from the DNA or guidance from the Supervisory Body is required. In case further input from the DNA or guidance from the Supervisory Body is sought, the Methodological Expert Panel shall finalize the draft revised standardized baseline at the meeting immediately following receipt of such input or guidance. The secretariat shall forward it to the Supervisory Body and make it publicly available on the UNFCCC website.
115. If the Methodological Expert Panel finds that further input from the DNA is required, the secretariat shall notify the DNA accordingly. In this case, the DNA should submit the requested input within 28 days of the notification. If the DNA does not submit the requested input within the deadline, the secretariat shall suspend the development of the draft revised standardized baseline and ascertain from the DNA whether it wishes that the draft revised standardized baseline continue to be developed. The secretariat shall resume development of the draft revised standardized baseline as soon as it receives the requested input. In any case, if the DNA does not provide the requested input within one

year of the initial notification, the secretariat shall terminate the development of the draft revised standardized baseline.

116. The secretariat shall assess the further input submitted by the DNA. If the secretariat finds that the further input is still not sufficient to develop the draft revised standardized baseline, the secretariat may initiate a direct communication with the DNA via e-mail or conference calls to clarify remaining issues.
117. The secretariat shall revise the draft revised standardized baseline, taking into account the further input and direct communication with the DNA, as applicable. The secretariat shall forward the revised draft revised standardized baseline to the Methodological Expert Panel for its final consideration. The Methodological Expert Panel shall finalize the draft revised standardized baseline. The secretariat shall forward it to the Supervisory Body and make it publicly available on the UNFCCC website.

#### **6.2.5. Finalization of draft revised standardized baseline**

118. Before forwarding the draft revised standardized baseline in accordance with paragraphs 109, 114 or 117 above, the secretariat shall communicate the draft revised standardized baseline to the DNA. The DNA shall confirm that it is acceptable or request modifications to it within 14 days of receipt. If the DNA does not respond by this deadline, the forwarding of the draft revised standardized baseline to the Supervisory Body may be delayed accordingly. If the DNA does not accept the draft revised standardized baseline and/or requests modification to it in its response, the secretariat shall forward the draft revised standardized baseline and the response from the DNA to the two selected Methodological Expert Panel members, or to the Methodological Expert Panel, whichever considered the draft revised standardized baseline last. In this case, taking into account the response of the DNA, the two selected Methodological Expert Panel members shall finalize the draft revised standardized baseline within seven days of receipt, or the Methodological Expert Panel shall finalize the draft revised standardized baseline at its next meeting, as applicable.

#### **6.2.6. Consideration by the Supervisory Body**

119. If no member of the Supervisory Body objects to approving the draft revised standardized baseline received in accordance with paragraphs 109, 114 or 117 above within 28 days of receipt of the draft revised standardized baseline, the draft revised standardized baseline shall be deemed to be approved by the Supervisory Body.
120. 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.
121. If a member of the Supervisory Body objects to approving the draft revised standardized baseline 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.
122. If the Supervisory Body considers the case at its meeting, it shall decide on one of the following courses of action at the meeting:
  - (a) Approve the draft revised standardized baseline, indicating that:
    - (i) The revision is a major revision; or

- (ii) The revision is a minor revision;
  - (b) Not approve the draft revised standardized baseline;
  - (c) Continue the consideration of the draft revised standardized baseline at the next Supervisory Body meeting; or
  - (d) Request the Methodological Expert Panel to review the draft revised standardized baseline and provide guidance on the issues for the review.
123. Once a decision has been made by the Supervisory Body, the secretariat shall inform the DNA(s) of the decision and any guidance provided by the Supervisory Body, as applicable, and make the decision and guidance publicly available on the UNFCCC website.

#### **6.2.7. Other**

124. The secretariat may propose an editorial revision to an approved standardized baseline at any time. In this case, the secretariat shall submit a draft revised standardized baseline to the Chair of the Supervisory Body for his/her review. If the Chair agrees to the draft revised standardized baseline, the secretariat shall publish the revised standardized baseline on the UNFCCC website. The editorial revision shall be noted in the report of the next meeting of the Supervisory Body.

## **7. Clarification of a standardized baseline**

### **7.1. Bottom-up process**

#### **7.1.1. Submission of request for clarification**

125. The activity participants of a planned project or PoA, the coordinating/managing entity of a planned PoA, a DOE, a DNA or any other stakeholder (hereinafter in section 7.1 referred to as the enquirer) may, taking into account the principles for clarifications referred to in appendix to this procedure, request clarification of an approved standardized baseline by submitting the completed “Form: Approved standardized baseline clarification request” to the secretariat through a specified e-mail account made available on the UNFCCC website.

#### **7.1.2. Initial assessment**

126. The secretariat shall give notice of the receipt of the request for clarification to the DNA of a Party to which the approved standardized baseline applies within seven days of receipt.
127. The secretariat shall undertake an initial assessment of the submission using the “Form: Approved standardized baseline clarification request initial assessment” within 21 days of receipt of the submission, to determine whether:
- (a) The “Form: Approved standardized baseline clarification request”, including the name and contact details of the enquirer, has been duly completed; and
  - (a) The submission is categorized as either:
    - (i) Involving no regulatory and/or technical ambiguity or only simple regulatory and/or technical issues, hence requiring no analysis or only a simple analysis to formulate a clarification; or

- (ii) Involving complex regulatory and/or technical issues and/or having the potential to apply to multiple versions of the approved standardized baseline, hence requiring a thorough analysis to formulate a clarification.

128. 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 the 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.

129. Upon conclusion of the initial assessment, the secretariat shall notify the enquirer of the conclusion of the initial assessment. If the submission is concluded as incomplete in accordance with paragraph 128 above, the secretariat shall communicate the underlying reasons 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.

#### **7.1.3. Fast track**

130. If the submission is determined as being the case referred to in paragraph 127(a)(i) above, the secretariat shall prepare a clarification using the “Form: Approved standardized baseline clarification response” and send it to the enquirer and the DNA within nine days of the successful conclusion of the initial assessment.

131. In preparing the clarification, the secretariat may consult with the Methodological Expert Panel. In this case, the timeline referred to in paragraph 130 above shall not apply. The secretariat shall send a draft clarification to the Methodological Expert Panel within nine days of the successful conclusion of the initial assessment. 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. 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.

132. The secretariat shall publish the clarification on the UNFCCC website.

#### **7.1.4. Regular track**

133. If the submission is determined as being the case referred to in paragraph 127(a)(ii) above, the secretariat shall prepare a draft recommendation of a clarification to the Methodological Expert Panel using the “Form: Approved standardized baseline clarification response”.

134. In preparing the draft recommendation, the secretariat may draw upon external expertise, depending on the technical complexity of the issues in question and the availability of expertise in the secretariat, by selecting a maximum of two external experts from the Methodologies Roster of Experts. If the secretariat does not find suitable and available experts on the roster, it may use the services of experts not included on the roster.

135. 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.
136. 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 27 above.
137. The secretariat may also forward the draft recommendation to the DNA for review. In this case, the DNA shall provide input on the draft recommendation within seven days of receipt.
138. The secretariat shall finalize the recommendation, taking into account the input from the selected member and the DNA, as applicable, and submit it to the Methodological Expert Panel for consideration.
139. 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, indicating the version(s) of the approved standardized baseline to which the clarification applies. The Methodological Expert Panel shall make every effort to finalize the recommendation within one meeting.
140. 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.
141. 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.
142. 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.
143. 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; or
  - (a) Request the Methodological Expert Panel to review the recommendation to the Supervisory Body and provide guidance on the issues for review.
144. If the Supervisory Body approves the clarification, the secretariat shall send the finalized clarification to the enquirer and the DNA.
145. The secretariat shall publish the clarification on the UNFCCC website.

#### **7.1.5. Other**

146. At any step before the clarification is finalized in accordance with paragraphs 130, 131 or (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.

## **7.2. Top-down process**

147. If the Supervisory Body, the Methodological Expert Panel, or the secretariat finds it necessary, taking into account the principles for clarifications referred to in appendix to this procedure, to clarify provisions of an approved standardized baseline, the process to revise the approved standardized baseline as defined in section 6.2 shall be followed. In this case, the draft revised standardized baseline shall incorporate all relevant clarifications issued prior to the revision.

## **8. Update of a standardized baseline**

### **8.1. Bottom-up process**

#### **8.1.1. Submission of a proposed updated standardized baseline**

148. A proponent may propose an updated standardized baseline through the DNA of the Party for which the updated standardized baseline is proposed. In doing so, the proponent shall ensure that the proposed updated standardized baseline complies<sup>16</sup> with the “Standard: Determining coverage of data and validity of standardized baselines”, including the requirements related to the data coverage period, data currentness and the validity of standardized baselines. The DNA should subsequently submit the proposed updated standardized baseline to the secretariat in accordance with paragraphs 149–151 below.

149. The DNA submitting the proposed updated standardized baseline shall submit the following documentation to the secretariat through a specified e-mail account made available on the UNFCCC website between 270 to 180 days prior to the date when the validity of the current standardized baseline expires:<sup>17</sup>

- (a) The completed “Form: Approved standardized baseline update request”;
- (a) The proposed updated standardized baseline, highlighting the proposed changes to the approved standardized baseline;
- (b) A spreadsheet<sup>18</sup> containing all data used and the calculations performed for the establishment of the proposed updated standardized baseline;
- (c) A quality control report prepared in accordance with the “Guideline: Quality assurance and quality control of data used in the establishment of standardized baselines”;
- (d) An assessment report on the proposed updated standardized baseline containing the information referred to in paragraph 17 above and prepared in accordance with paragraph 150 below.

---

<sup>16</sup> Deviations from the requirements in the standard may be proposed with due justification when proposing an update of an approved standardized baseline.

<sup>17</sup> Any delay in the submission from this time frame may create a gap period between the expiry of the current standardized baseline and the entry-into-force of the updated standardized baseline. For the requirement for addressing such gap period, see section 9 below.

<sup>18</sup> In an accessible and verifiable (unprotected) format.

- (e) All additional documentation supporting the submission (e.g. statistics and/or, studies etc.), where applicable;
  - (f) Letter of approval on the proposed updated standardized baseline from the DNA.
150. In cases where no new or additional data were required to establish the proposed updated standardized baseline:
- (a) The documentation referred to in paragraph 149(c) above is not required to be submitted;
  - (b) The assessment report referred to in paragraph 149(d) above does not need to include a positive assessment opinion on the compliance of the quality assurance and quality control system referred to in paragraph 17(a) above. Consequently, the assessment report only needs to include a positive assessment opinion that the proposed standardized baseline meets the requirements of one of the approaches referred to in paragraph 17(b) above.
151. The assessment report referred to in paragraph 149(d) above may be prepared by a DOE contracted and paid for by either the DNA or any other entity under agreement with the DNA. Alternatively, an assessment report may be prepared by a DOE with funding support in accordance with the modalities described in appendix 1 to this procedure.
152. The secretariat shall make every effort to inform the DNA in advance of the period for requesting update of the approved standardized baseline. It remains the responsibility of the DNA to ensure that all actions are taken in accordance with this section of the procedure in a timely manner.
153. The Supervisory Body may, upon request from the DNA, decide to request the secretariat to provide technical support to the DNA for the preparation of the request without prejudice to the outcome of the subsequent request.
154. No fee shall be payable to the secretariat for the submission of the proposed updated standardized baseline.

#### **8.1.2. Initial assessment**

155. The secretariat shall undertake an initial assessment of the submission using the “Form: Approved standardized baseline update request initial assessment” within 21 days of receipt of the submission. The secretariat shall assess whether:
- (a) The DNA submitted all the documentation in accordance with paragraphs 149 and 150 above;
  - (b) The “Form: Approved standardized baseline update request”, including the name and contact details of the proponent, has been duly completed;
  - (a) The proposed updated standardized baseline was derived from the same approach as the one used in the approved standardized baseline that is being proposed for an update;
  - (b) The proposed updated standardized baseline, if developed using the approach referred to in paragraphs 10(a) or 10(b) above, does not require revision to the underlying approved methodology or methodological tool. If it requires such revision, the secretariat shall propose that the Board carry out the revision through

the top-down process in accordance with the “Procedure: development, revision and clarification of baseline and monitoring methodologies and methodological tools”;

- (c) The assessment report includes positive assessment opinion in accordance with paragraph 17 above.
156. The secretariat shall inform the DNA and the proponent of the outcome of the initial assessment. If the secretariat finds that the required documentation or information is incomplete, it shall notify the DNA and the proponent accordingly. In this case, the DNA should provide the missing documents or information within 42 days of the notification.
157. The secretariat shall conclude the initial assessment within 14 days of receipt of missing documents or information and inform the DNA and the proponent of the conclusion of the initial assessment. If the DNA does not provide the missing documents or information within the deadline, the secretariat shall suspend processing the submission and ascertain from the DNA whether it wishes that the proposed updated standardized baseline continues to be considered. The secretariat shall resume processing the submission as soon as it receives the missing documents or information. In any case, if the DNA does not provide the missing documents or information within one year of the initial notification, the submission shall be considered withdrawn.
158. Upon successful conclusion of the initial assessment, the secretariat shall assign a reference number to the proposed updated standardized baseline and make the submitted documentation publicly available on the UNFCCC website with the exception of information declared confidential and/or proprietary by the DNA. Aggregated data and information used to derive the standardized baseline shall not be considered confidential or proprietary.

### **8.1.3. Preparation of a draft recommendation**

159. Within 28 days of the successful conclusion of the initial assessment, the secretariat shall prepare a draft recommendation on the proposed updated standardized baseline using either:
- (a) The “Form: Approved standardized baseline update recommendation” for the recommended course of action referred to in paragraphs 160(a) or 160(c) below; or
- (a) The “Form: Approved standardized baseline update request” for the recommended course of action referred to in paragraph 160(b) below.
160. The secretariat shall include in its draft recommendation one of the following courses of action:
- (a) Approve the proposed updated standardized baseline;
- (b) Request further input (e.g. additional information or modification to the submitted documentation) from the DNA and the proponent; or
- (c) Not approve the proposed updated standardized baseline.
161. In preparing the draft recommendation, the secretariat may draw upon external expertise, depending on the technical complexity of the proposed updated standardized baseline and the availability of expertise in the secretariat, by selecting a maximum of two external



experts from the Methodologies Roster of Experts. If the secretariat does not find suitable and available experts on the roster, it may use the services of experts not included on the roster.

162. The secretariat shall select two members of the Methodological Expert Panel and forward its draft recommendation to them.

#### **8.1.4. Consideration by selected members of the Methodological Expert Panel**

163. The two selected members of the Methodological Expert Panel shall, within seven days of receipt of the draft recommendation, independently assess the proposed updated standardized baseline and the draft recommendation and inform the secretariat of the outcome of their assessment.
164. If both of the selected members of the Methodological Expert Panel agree to the draft recommendation to approve or not to approve the proposed updated standardized baseline, the secretariat shall forward it as the recommendation to the Supervisory Body and make it publicly available on the UNFCCC website.
165. If both of the selected members of the Methodological Expert Panel agree to the draft recommendation that the proposed updated standardized baseline requires further input from the DNA, the secretariat shall notify the DNA and the proponent accordingly using the "Form: Approved standardized baseline update request". The DNA should submit the requested input within 28 days of the notification. All the input shall be highlighted in the "Form: Approved standardized baseline update request". If the DNA does not provide the requested input within the deadline, the secretariat shall suspend processing the submission and ascertain from the DNA whether it wishes that the proposed standardized baseline continue to be considered. The secretariat shall resume processing the submission as soon as it receives the requested input. In any case, if the DNA does not provide the requested input within one year of the initial notification, the submission shall be considered withdrawn.
166. The secretariat shall assess the further input submitted by the DNA. If the secretariat finds that it is still not sufficient to recommend that the proposed updated standardized baseline be approved or not approved, the secretariat may initiate a direct communication with the DNA and the proponent via e-mail or conference calls to clarify remaining issues.
167. The secretariat shall revise the draft recommendation, taking into account the further input and direct communication with the DNA and the proponent, as applicable, to recommend that the proposed updated standardized baseline be either approved or not approved. The secretariat shall forward the revised draft recommendation to the two selected members of the Methodological Expert Panel for their consideration. In this case, the steps in paragraphs 164 or 168–172 below shall follow.

#### **8.1.5. Consideration by the Methodological Expert Panel**

168. If at least one selected member of the Methodological Expert Panel disagrees with the draft recommendation or requests that it be considered by the Methodological Expert Panel, the secretariat shall forward the draft recommendation to the Methodological Expert Panel. The Methodological Expert Panel shall consider the proposed updated standardized baseline and the draft recommendation at its next meeting, provided it is received at least 14 days before the meeting; otherwise it shall be considered at the meeting after that one.

169. The Methodological Expert Panel shall finalize its consideration within two meetings, unless it finds that further input from the DNA or guidance from the Supervisory Body is required. In case further input from the DNA or guidance from the Supervisory Body is sought, the Methodological Expert Panel shall finalize its consideration at the meeting immediately following receipt of such input or guidance. In finalizing its consideration, the Methodological Expert Panel shall conclude to recommend that the proposed updated standardized baseline be either approved or not approved. The secretariat shall forward it as the recommendation to the Supervisory Body and make it publicly available on the UNFCCC website.
170. If the Methodological Expert Panel finds that further input from the DNA is required, the secretariat shall notify the DNA and the proponent accordingly. In this case, the DNA should submit the requested input within 28 days of the notification. If the DNA does not submit the requested input within the deadline, the secretariat shall suspend processing the submission and ascertain from the DNA whether it wishes that the proposed standardized baseline continues to be considered. The secretariat shall resume processing the submission as soon as it receives the requested input. In any case, if the DNA does not provide the requested input within one year of the initial notification, the submission shall be considered withdrawn.
171. The secretariat shall assess the further input submitted by the DNA. If the secretariat finds that the further input is still not sufficient to recommend that the proposed updated standardized baseline be approved or not approved, the secretariat may initiate a direct communication with the DNA and the proponent via e-mail or conference calls to clarify remaining issues.
172. The secretariat shall revise the draft recommendation, taking into account the further input and direct communication with the DNA and the proponent, as applicable, to recommend that the proposed updated standardized baseline be either approved or not approved. The secretariat shall forward the revised draft recommendation to the Methodological Expert Panel for its final consideration. The Methodological Expert Panel shall conclude to recommend that the proposed updated standardized baseline be either approved or not approved. The secretariat shall forward it as the recommendation to the Supervisory Body and make it publicly available on the UNFCCC website.

#### **8.1.6. Preparation of draft updated standardized baseline**

173. If the draft recommendation is to approve the proposed updated standardized baseline in accordance with paragraphs 164, 169 or 172 above, the secretariat shall, before forwarding it as the recommendation to the Supervisory Body, reformat the proposed updated standardized baseline and send it to the two selected Methodological Expert Panel members or to the Methodological Expert Panel, whichever considered it last. Upon receipt of an agreement on the reformatted updated standardized baseline from the two selected Methodological Expert Panel members, or from the Methodological Expert Panel, as applicable, the secretariat shall communicate the reformatted updated standardized baseline to the DNA and the proponent. The DNA shall confirm that it is acceptable or request modifications to it within seven days of receipt. If the DNA does not respond by this deadline, the forwarding of the recommendation to the Supervisory Body may be delayed accordingly. If the DNA does not accept the reformatted updated standardized baseline and/or requests modification to it in its response, the secretariat shall forward the reformatted updated standardized baseline and the response from the DNA to the two selected Methodological Expert Panel members, or to the Methodological Expert Panel, whichever considered the draft recommendation last. In this case, taking into account the

response from the DNA, the two selected Methodological Expert Panel members shall finalize the reformatted updated standardized baseline within seven days of receipt, or the Methodological Expert Panel shall finalize the reformatted updated standardized baseline at its next meeting, as applicable.

#### **8.1.7. Consideration by the Supervisory Body**

174. If no member of the Supervisory Body objects to the recommendation received in accordance with paragraphs 164, 169 or 172 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.
175. 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.
176. 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.
177. If the Supervisory Body considers the case at its meeting, it shall decide on one of the following courses of action at the meeting:
  - (a) Approve the proposed updated standardized baseline;
  - (b) Not approve the proposed updated standardized baseline;
  - (c) Continue the consideration of the proposed baseline at the next Supervisory Body meeting; or
  - (d) Request the Methodological Expert Panel to review the recommendation and provide guidance on the issues for the review.
178. Once a decision has been made by the Supervisory Body, the secretariat shall inform the DNA and the proponent of the decision and any guidance provided by the Supervisory Body, as applicable, and make the decision and guidance publicly available on the UNFCCC website.
179. If the proposed updated standardized baseline is not approved, the DNA may at any time resubmit a proposed updated standardized baseline with revised documentation. Upon submission of the revised documentation, the submission shall be treated as a new submission of a proposed updated standardized baseline.

## **9. Validity of new, updated and revised standardized baselines**

180. The reference number of an approved new standardized baseline shall indicate the year when the standardized baseline comes into force. The approved new or revised standardized baseline shall come into force from the date as indicated in the approved new or revised standardized baseline. From this date, a project or PoA may apply the approved new or revised standardized baseline for the purpose of publishing a PDD or PoA-DD for global stakeholder consultation, submitting a request for registration, or submitting a request for renewal of the crediting period or PoA period, in accordance with

the “Activity cycle procedure for projects” or “Activity cycle procedure for programmes of activities”. The approved new or revised standardized baseline shall be valid for the period indicated in the approved new or revised standardized baseline. The validity period of a standardized baseline does not change due to a revision.

181. The year indicated in the reference number of an approved standardized baseline shall be replaced by the year when an updated standardized baseline comes into force if the Supervisory Body approves the updated standardized baseline in accordance with paragraph 177(a) above. The version number of the updated standardized baseline shall also be reset to 01.0 (e.g. from 02.1 to 01.0). The updated standardized baseline shall come into force from the date as indicated in the updated standardized baseline for the purpose of publishing a PDD or PoA-DD for global stakeholder consultation, submitting a request for registration, or submitting a request for renewal of the crediting period or PoA period, in accordance with the “Activity cycle procedure for projects” or “Activity cycle procedure for programmes of activities”. If, after the publication of a PDD or PoA-DD for global stakeholder consultation, the applied standardized baseline has expired and an updated standardized baseline is available at the time of submission of a request for registration or renewal, the activity participants or the coordinating/managing entity shall revise the PDD or PoA-DD applying the updated standardized baseline. If, after the publication of the PDD or PoA-DD for global stakeholder consultation, the applied standardized baseline has expired and no valid updated standardized baseline is available at the time of submission of a request for registration or renewal, the activity participants or the coordinating/managing entity shall revise the PDD or PoA-DD replacing the standardized baseline with the corresponding parameter values calculated by themselves in accordance with the applied methodology and/or applicable methodological tool. In these cases, the DOE shall not publish the revised PDD or PoA-DD for global stakeholder consultation but shall submit it when it submits a request for registration unless otherwise decided by the Supervisory Body when it approves the updated standardized baseline. The updated standardized baseline shall be valid for the period indicated in the approved updated standardized baseline.
182. If the entry into force of an updated standardized baseline is not immediately after the expiry of its previous version, thus creating a gap period in the validity of the two consecutive versions of the standardized baseline, the activity participants and the coordinating/managing entities shall, for the purpose of publishing a PDD or PoA-DD for global stakeholder consultation, submitting a request for registration, or submitting a request for renewal of the crediting period or PoA period, in accordance with the “Activity cycle procedure for projects” or “Activity cycle procedure for programmes of activities”, choose one of the following options for calculating baseline emissions for such gap period:
- (a) Determine the parameter values in accordance with the applied methodology and/or applicable methodological tool;
  - (b) Use the more conservative value between the previous and the updated standardized baseline.
183. The version number of an approved standardized baseline shall increase by one whole number (e.g. from 01.0 to 02.0) if the Supervisory Body approves a revised standardized baseline indicating that it is a major revision in accordance with paragraphs 99(i) or 122(i) above. In this case, for the purpose of publishing a PDD or PoA-DD for global stakeholder consultation, submitting a request for registration, or submitting a request for renewal of

the crediting period or PoA period in accordance with the “Activity cycle procedure for projects” or “Activity cycle procedure for programmes of activities”:

- (a) A project or PoA may still apply the previous version:
  - (i) Until the 240<sup>th</sup> day from the date when the revised version becomes effective unless the previous version has been put on hold by the Supervisory Body in accordance with paragraphs 104(a) or 104(b) above, if the remaining validity of the standardized baseline for the current period is longer than this 240-day period; or
  - (ii) Until the validity of the standardized baseline for the current period expires unless the previous version has been put on hold by the Supervisory Body in accordance with paragraphs 104(a) or 104(b) above, if the remaining validity of the standardized baseline for the current period is not longer than this 240-day period; 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 paragraphs 104(a) or 104(b) above, as applicable, for the purpose of publishing a PDD or PoA-DD for global stakeholder consultation, submitting a request for registration, or submitting a request for renewal of the crediting period or PoA period in accordance with the “Activity cycle procedure for projects” or “Activity cycle procedure for programmes of activities”. If a PDD or PoA-DD applying the previous version has already been published for global stakeholder consultation, the activity 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 standardized baseline.

184. The version number of an approved standardized baseline shall increase by one fractional number in the first decimal place (e.g. from 01.0 to 01.1) if the Supervisory Body approves a revised standardized baseline indicating that it is a minor revision in accordance with paragraphs 99(ii) or 122(ii) above, or if an editorial revision to an approved standardized baseline has been made in accordance with paragraph 124 above. In this case, for the purpose of publishing a PDD or PoA-DD for global stakeholder consultation, submitting a request for registration, or submitting a request for renewal of the crediting period or PoA period in accordance with the “Activity cycle procedure for projects” or “Activity cycle procedure for programmes of activities”, a project or PoA may still apply the previous version or any earlier version of minor revision:

- (a) Until the 240<sup>th</sup> day from the date when the next major revision becomes effective unless the previous or earlier version(s) has been put on hold by the Supervisory Body in accordance with paragraphs 104(a) or 104(b) above, if the remaining validity of the standardized baseline for the current period after the next major revision is longer than this 240-day period; or
- (b) Until the validity of the standardized baseline for the current period expires unless the previous version has been put on hold by the Supervisory Body in accordance with paragraphs 104(a) or 104(b) above, if the remaining validity of the standardized baseline after the next major revision is not longer than this 240-day period.

## **Appendix 1. Funding modalities for the preparation of assessment reports for establishing standardized baselines**

1. A designated national authority (DNA) for the the Article 6.4 mechanism may engage a designated operational entity (DOE) to prepare an assessment report using its own resources or with the funding support from the secretariat. The latter is subject to availability of funds.
2. The Supervisory Body shall determine the total amount of funding available for such funding support and the period for which the funding is made available. The Board may also determine a ceiling on the fund available for the preparation of each assessment report.
3. The secretariat or its contractual partner UN organization (e.g., The United Nations Office for Project Services) will conduct a procurement exercise with eligible and interested DOEs and have a framework contract with the selected DOEs.
4. The DNA that wishes to receive support from the secretariat for the preparation of the assessment report may request support by submitting a duly completed “Request for funding for assessment report form” to the secretariat.
5. Within 21 days of receipt of the submission from the DNA, the secretariat shall confirm whether the funding is available and whether the submission is complete.
6. If the secretariat finds that the submission is incomplete, it shall inform the DNA accordingly and request it to submit any missing documents or information to the secretariat within 10 days.
7. If the missing documents or information are not submitted within the deadline referred to in paragraph 6 of this appendix, the secretariat shall suspend processing the request for funding until it receives the missing documents or information.
8. Once the submission is considered complete, subject to availability of funds, the secretariat or another UN entity under agreement with the secretariat shall make a contractual arrangement with the DOE.
9. The DOE shall prepare an assessment report according to the timeline agreed.
10. Once the standardized baseline is submitted and considered complete, the secretariat shall make arrangements through its contractual partner to disburse the funds to the DOE.

## **Appendix 2. Principles for the revision and clarification of standardized baselines**

### **1. Background**

1. This appendix provides guiding principles for initiating a revision to an approved standardized baseline and for initiating a (request for) clarification of an approved standardized baseline.

### **2. Principle for revision**

2. A revision is the modification of an approved standardized baseline in order to improve it or broaden its scope and applicability.
3. A revision of an approved standardized baseline may be initiated 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 standardized baseline or that the reductions or enhancements may not be real, measurable and verifiable;
  - (b) The applicability conditions require broadening to include more potential project activity types or conditions for use;
  - (c) There are identified inconsistencies, errors and/or ambiguities in the language and/or formulae used within the approved standardized baseline;
  - (d) Further simplification (e.g. default values) is required to improve the user-friendliness of the approved standardized baseline;
  - (e) Key issues clarified through a request for clarification of the approved standardized baseline in accordance with section 7 of (the main part of) this procedure are required to be incorporated in the approved standardized baseline;
  - (f) There are changes to the additionality demonstration, baseline and/or baseline emission factors as determined in the approved standardized baseline.

### **3. Principles for clarification**

4. A clarification on an approved standardized baseline is to clarify:
  - (a) The applicability of the approved standardized baseline;
  - (b) Various procedures provided in the approved standardized baseline, inter alia, for identifying the baseline scenario, demonstrating additionality and estimating baseline emission factors; or
  - (c) Monitoring data and procedures provided in the approved standardized baseline.

5. A clarification on an approved standardized baseline may be requested if:
- (a) Any of the provisions of the approved standardized baseline 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 standardized baseline is to be applied.

- - - - -

### Document information

<i>Version</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
02.1	30 June 2023	Editorial change to paragraph 46.
02.0	26 June 2023	Published as an annex to the annotated agenda of SB 006. This version takes into account the guidance provided by the Supervisory Body at the SB 005 meeting (SB005 meeting report, paragraph 16).
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: A6.4 mechanism, standardized baselines, regulatory framework

DRAFT