

**DRAFT****Annex 18****COVER NOTE****DRAFT PROCEDURE FOR THE DEVELOPMENT, REVISION AND CLARIFICATION
OF BASELINE AND MONITORING METHODOLOGIES AND METHODOLOGICAL TOOLS****I. Background**

1. The attached document was developed in accordance with the “CDM management plan 2012” under its objective A (i) “Ensure operational capacity and improve efficiency in the operation of the CDM” (project number 134).
2. The concept note on the development of this document was presented to the Board at its sixty-eighth meeting. The Board requested the secretariat to prepare a draft procedure taking into account the inputs given by the Board for its consideration at its sixty-ninth meeting.
3. Stakeholders provided inputs on the concept note at the CDM roundtable held on 10 August 2012.

II. Purpose

4. The purpose of the development of this procedure is to:
 - (a) Ensure the consistency of the processes for different project activity types with regard to the development, revision and clarification of methodologies and methodological tools;
 - (b) Streamline the processes as much as possible while maintaining their integrity, to speed up the development, revision and clarification of methodologies and methodological tools;
 - (c) Define currently unwritten or unelaborated processes, namely the processes for “top-down” development, revision and clarification of methodologies and methodological tools;
 - (d) Improve the effectiveness and clarify the processes for the development, revision and clarification of methodologies and methodological tools in general.

III. Key issues and proposed solutions

5. Key issues and proposed solutions for the Board’s consideration are:
 - (a) **Types of stakeholders eligible to initiate the process:** The draft procedure proposes to change this aspect in the existing procedures from limiting to project participants (through DOEs) to allowing any stakeholder to propose a new methodology, a revised methodology or methodological tool. For the clarification process, the draft procedure proposes two options: to allow any stakeholder, or to limit to project participants, coordinating/managing entities and DOEs;
 - (b) **Charging of fees:** The draft procedure proposes to possibly remove charging fees for proposing a new methodology by presenting the corresponding provision in square

**DRAFT**

brackets, thereby abolishing charging of fees in any of the processes covered by the procedure;

- (c) **Top-down process:** The draft procedure for the first time defines and elaborates the top-down process for all the processes covered by the procedure;
- (d) **Consolidation process:** The draft procedure for the first time directly incorporates the consolidation process within the processes for the development of new and revised methodologies and methodological tools, based on the “Guidance on criteria for considerations and revision of methodologies”;
- (e) **Roles of methodological panel, working group, independent experts and the secretariat:** The draft procedure proposes to involve one or two members of a relevant methodological panel or working group at the (full) assessment stage for the secretariat to make a recommendation to the panel or working group (except for the super-fast track in the clarification process). The draft procedure also proposes to make it optional to use independent experts. The draft procedure further proposes to delegate some administrative functions to the secretariat (e.g. selection of panel or working group members and independent experts to be involved in the assessment);
- (f) **Put-on-hold cases:** The draft procedure proposes the Board to reconsider the current provision of putting on hold a methodology or methodological tool with a grace period, by presenting the corresponding provision in square brackets;
- (g) **Version numbering and applicability:** The draft procedure proposes to simplify the current provision on version numbering and applicability conditions.

IV. Proposed work and timelines

- 6. It is proposed that:
 - (a) The secretariat conducts a public call for inputs on a revised draft procedure that will have incorporated the Board’s consideration on this draft at its sixty-ninth meeting;
 - (b) The secretariat further revises the draft procedure for the Board’s consideration and adoption at its seventieth meeting;
 - (c) The Board considers and decides on the implementation plan at its seventieth meeting, taking into account, inter alia, the time required for developing supporting documentation, the IT system and training.

V. Impacts

- 7. Project participants and coordinating/managing entities who apply a methodology or methodological tool to their project activities or programmes of activities would benefit from the improved predictability and possibly faster adoption of final products (new or revised methodologies or methodological tools, and clarifications).
- 8. Other stakeholders would also benefit from the transparency of the process in particular of the top-down process.

**DRAFT**

9. The CDM process as a whole would benefit from having consistent level of robustness of methodologies and methodological tools.

VI. Recommendations to the Board

10. The secretariat recommends the Board to consider the draft procedure and provide guidance on the direction of modification to it.

VII. References

11. Once adopted, this procedure would supersede nine existing procedures and one guidance listed in the “History of the document” box at the end of this annex.

**DRAFT****DRAFT PROCEDURE FOR THE DEVELOPMENT, REVISION AND CLARIFICATION
OF BASELINE AND MONITORING METHODOLOGIES AND METHODOLOGICAL TOOLS****(Version 01.0)****CONTENTS**

	<i>Paragraphs</i>	<i>Page</i>
I. Introduction.....	1–6	6
A. Background.....	1–5	6
B. Objectives.....	6	6
II. Scope and applicability	7	7
III. Terms and definitions.....	8	7
IV. Development of new methodology or methodological tool.....	9–46	7
A. Bottom-up process	9–32	7
1. Submission of proposed new methodology.....	9–11	7
2. Completeness check	12–14	8
3. Initial assessment.....	15–18	9
4. Preparation of draft recommendation	19–23	9
5. Consideration by panel or working group	24–28	10
6. Consideration by the Board	29–30	11
7. Other.....	31–32	11
B. Top-down process	33–46	11
1. Initiation	33–34	11
2. Preparation of draft new methodology or methodological tool.....	35–41	11
3. Consideration by panel or working group	42–44	12
4. Consideration by the Board	45–46	12
V. Revision of approved methodology or methodological tool.....	47–81	13
A. Bottom-up process	47–69	13
1. Submission of proposed revised methodology or methodological tool.....	47–48	13
2. Completeness check	49–51	14
3. Initial assessment.....	52–55	14
4. Preparation of draft recommendation	56–60	15
5. Consideration by panel or working group	61–65	15
6. Consideration by the Board	66–67	16
7. Other.....	68–69	16
B. Top-down process	70–81	17
1. Initiation	70–71	17

**DRAFT**

2. Preparation of draft revised methodology or methodological tool	72–75	17
3. Consideration by panel or working group	76–78	18
4. Consideration by the Board	79–80	18
5. Other	81	18
VI. Validity of new, revised and previous versions	82–86	18
VII. Clarification of approved methodology or methodological tool.....	87–108	20
A. Bottom-up process	87–107	20
1. Submission of request for clarification.....	87–88	20
2. Completeness check	89–91	20
3. Initial assessment.....	92	21
4. Super-fast track.....	93–94	21
5. Fast track	95–98	21
6. Regular track	99–105	21
7. Other.....	106–107	22
B. Top-down process	108	22
Appendix: Principles for revision and consolidation of methodologies.....		23



DRAFT

I. Introduction

A. Background

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

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

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

4. This document, developed in accordance with the “CDM management plan 2012” under its objective A (i) “Ensure operational capacity and improve efficiency in the operation of the CDM”, consolidates all procedural provisions relating to the development of new methodologies and methodological tools, revisions and clarifications of approved methodologies and methodological tools, for both “bottom-up” and “top-down” processes.

5. The history box at the end of this document lists all documents that will be superseded by this document.

B. Objectives

6. The objectives of the “Procedure for the development, revision and clarification of baseline and monitoring methodologies and methodological tools” (hereinafter referred to as this procedure) are to:

- (a) Improve the consistency and clarity in processing by the Board, relevant methodological panel or working group and the secretariat of the submissions of proposed new

**DRAFT**

methodologies, proposed revised methodologies and methodological tools, and requests for clarification on approved methodologies and methodological tools;

- (b) Define and document the processes for the “top-down” development of new methodologies and methodological tools, “top-down” revision and clarification of approved methodologies and methodological tools, initiated by the Board, based on proposals from a relevant methodological panel or working group, or the secretariat, where applicable;
- (c) Enhance the overall efficiency and integrity of the CDM.

II. Scope and applicability

7. This procedure describes the administrative steps to follow for project participants for project activities, coordinating/managing entities for PoAs, designated operational entities (DOEs), other stakeholders, the Board, methodological panel and working groups and the secretariat, for developing new methodologies and methodological tools, for revising approved methodologies and methodological tools, and for providing clarifications of approved methodologies and methodological tools.¹

III. Terms and definitions

8. In addition to the definitions in the “Glossary of CDM terms”, the following terms apply in this procedure:

- (a) “Shall” is used to indicate requirements to be followed;
- (b) “Should” is used to indicate that among several possibilities, one course of action is recommended as particularly suitable;
- (c) “May” is used to indicate what is permitted.

IV. Development of new methodology or methodological tool**A. Bottom-up process****1. Submission of proposed new methodology**

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

- (a) The duly completed “New baseline and monitoring methodology/methodological tool proposal form” (F-CDM-PNM);
- (b) The proposed new methodology or methodological tool;

¹ This procedure does not apply to clarification requests on guidelines and standards on methodologies. Such requests shall be submitted and processed under the “Modalities and procedures for direct communication with stakeholders”.

**DRAFT**

- (c) The draft project design document (PDD) of the planned CDM project activity or the draft programme design document (PoA-DD) of the planned PoA that intends to apply the proposed new methodology, using a relevant form (F-CDM-PDD, F-CDM-SSC-PDD, F-CDM-AR-PDD, F-CDM-SSC-AR-PDD, F-CDM-CCS-PDD, F-CDM-PoA-DD, F-CDM-SSC-PoA-DD, F-CDM-AR-PoA-DD or F-CDM-SSC-AR-PoA-DD) with at least the following sections of the form and relevant appendices completed:
- (i) For planned CDM project activities:
 - Description of project activity;
 - Application of selected approved baseline and monitoring methodology;
 - Duration and crediting period;
 - (ii) For planned CDM PoAs:
 - General description of PoA;
 - Demonstration of additionality and development of eligibility criteria;
 - Duration of PoA;
 - General description of a generic CPA;
 - Application of a baseline and monitoring methodology.

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

11. [A fee of USD 1,000 shall be payable for each submission of a proposal of a new methodology or methodological tool. If the fee is not paid by the deadline referred to in paragraph 10 above, the submission shall not be regarded as having been received by the deadline.]

2. Completeness check

12. The secretariat shall conduct a completeness check of the submission within seven (7) days of the deadline for submissions referred to in paragraph 10 above.

13. If the secretariat finds that the submission is incomplete, it shall request the proponent to submit the missing or revised documents and/or information. In this case, the proponent shall submit the requested documents and/or information to the secretariat within five (5) days of receipt of the request. If the proponent does not submit the requested documents and/or information by this deadline, the secretariat shall conclude that the submission is incomplete.

14. Upon conclusion of the completeness check, the secretariat shall notify the proponent of the conclusion of the completeness check. If the submission is concluded as incomplete in accordance with paragraph 13 above, the secretariat shall communicate the underlying reasons to the proponent. In this

**DRAFT**

case, the proponent may resubmit the proposed new methodology with revised documentation at any time. Upon submission, the revised documentation shall be treated as a new submission of a proposed new methodology under this procedure.

3. Initial assessment

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

16. If, during the initial assessment, the secretariat identifies minor issues in the submission, it shall request the proponent to submit the missing or revised documents and/or information. In this case, the proponent shall submit the requested documents and/or information to the secretariat within five (5) days of receipt of the request. If the proponent does not submit the requested documents and/or information by this deadline, the secretariat shall conclude that the submission is incomplete.

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

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

4. Preparation of draft recommendation

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

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

21. In preparing the draft recommendation, the secretariat may draw upon external expertise, depending on the technical complexity of the proposed new methodology, by selecting a maximum of two (2) independent experts to review the submission. For this purpose, the secretariat shall establish and maintain a roster of experts. If the secretariat does not find appropriate and available experts on the roster, it may use experts not included on the roster.

**DRAFT**

22. The secretariat shall select two (2) members of the relevant methodological panel or working group and forward the draft recommendation to them for their review. The selected members shall provide input on the draft recommendation within five (5) days of receipt of it.

23. The secretariat shall finalize the recommendation taking into account the input from the selected members of the relevant methodological panel or working group and submit it to the panel or working group for consideration at its meeting in accordance with paragraph 10 above, at the latest seven (7) days before the meeting.

5. Consideration by panel or working group

24. The relevant methodological panel or working group shall consider the recommendation and prepare a draft recommendation to the Board. The panel or working group shall make every effort to conclude its consideration and finalize the recommendation to the Board within three (3) consecutive meetings. The recommendation to the Board shall be to either:

- (a) Approve the proposed new methodology (“A case”); or
- (b) Reject the proposed new methodology (“C case”).

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

26. If, in preparing the draft recommendation to the Board, the relevant methodological panel or working group identifies issues in the proposed new methodology that may be addressed with clarifications or modifications, the panel or working group shall request the secretariat to communicate the issues to the proponent. In this case, the proponent shall provide clarifications or submit a modified proposed new methodology to address the identified issues to the secretariat within 28 days of the communication being made. If the proponent does not respond accordingly by this deadline, the panel or working group’s submission of a final recommendation to the Board may be delayed accordingly. If the proponent does not respond accordingly within 90 days, the submission shall be considered withdrawn.

27. If the relevant methodological panel or working group’s draft recommendation to the Board is to approve the proposed new methodology, the secretariat shall communicate a reformatted new methodology to the proponent. The proponent shall, within the time frame defined by the panel or working group, confirm that the reformatted new methodology is acceptable or request modifications to it. If the proponent does not respond accordingly by this deadline, the panel or working group’s submission of a final recommendation to the Board may be delayed accordingly.

28. The relevant methodological panel or working group shall finalize the recommendation to the Board taking into account the proponent’s responses referred to in paragraphs 25 and 27 above, and publish it in its corresponding meeting report. The secretariat shall place the recommendation to the Board on the agenda of the next Board meeting.

**DRAFT****6. Consideration by the Board**

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

- (a) Approve the proposed new methodology as recommended by the relevant methodological panel or working group;
- (b) Reject the proposed new methodology;
- (c) Request the relevant methodological panel or working group to review the recommendation to the Board, and provide guidance on the issues for review.

30. If the Board approves the proposed new methodology, the secretariat shall publish the approved new methodology on the UNFCCC CDM website within seven (7) days of the approval.

7. Other

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

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

B. Top-down process**1. Initiation**

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

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

2. Preparation of draft new methodology or methodological tool

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

36. The secretariat shall select two (2) members of the relevant methodological panel or working group and forward the draft development plan to them for their review. The selected members shall provide input on the draft development plan within five (5) days of receipt of it.

**DRAFT**

37. The secretariat shall finalize the development plan taking into account the input from the selected members of the relevant methodological panel or working group within five (5) days of receipt of the input.

38. The secretariat shall prepare a draft new methodology or methodological tool using the form “New baseline and monitoring methodology/methodological tool development form” (F-CDM-NM-D) within the time frame defined in the development plan.

39. In preparing the draft new methodology or methodological tool, the secretariat may draw upon external expertise, depending on the technical complexity of the new methodology or methodological tool, by selecting a maximum of two (2) independent experts from the roster of experts referred to in paragraph 21 above, to review the draft new methodology or methodological tool. If the secretariat does not find appropriate and available experts on the roster, it may use experts not included on the roster.

40. The secretariat shall forward the draft new methodology or methodological tool to the selected members of the relevant methodological panel or working group for their review. The selected members shall provide input on the draft new methodology or methodological tool within five (5) days of receipt of it.

41. The secretariat shall finalize the draft new methodology or methodological tool taking into account the input from the selected members of the relevant methodological panel or working group, and submit it to the panel or working group for consideration at its meeting, at the latest seven (7) days before the meeting.

3. Consideration by panel or working group

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

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

44. The relevant methodological panel or working group shall finalize the recommendation to the Board on the draft new methodology or methodological tool taking into account the comments received in the global stakeholder consultation, and publish it in its corresponding meeting report. The secretariat shall place the recommendation to the Board on the agenda of the next Board meeting.

4. Consideration by the Board

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

- (a) Approve the proposed new methodology or methodological tool;
- (b) Reject the proposed new methodology or methodological tool; or
- (c) Request the relevant methodological panel or working group to review the recommendation to the Board and provide guidance on the issues for review.

**DRAFT**

46. If the Board approves the proposed new methodology or methodological tool, the secretariat shall publish the approved new methodology or methodological tool on the UNFCCC CDM website within seven (7) days of the approval.

V. Revision of approved methodology or methodological tool**A. Bottom-up process****1. Submission of proposed revised methodology or methodological tool**

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

- (a) The duly completed “Approved baseline and monitoring methodology/methodological tool revision request form” (F-CDM-AMR);
- (b) The proposed revised methodology or methodological tool, highlighting the proposed changes to the approved methodology or methodological tool;
- (c) The draft PDD of a planned CDM project activity or the draft PoA-DD of a planned PoA that intends to apply the proposed revised methodology or methodological tool, using a relevant form (F-CDM-PDD, F-CDM-SSC-PDD, F-CDM-AR-PDD, F-CDM-SSC-AR-PDD, F-CDM-CCS-PDD, F-CDM-PoA-DD, F-CDM-SSC-PoA-DD, F-CDM-AR-PoA-DD or F-CDM-SSC-AR-PoA-DD) with at least the following sections of the form and relevant appendices completed:
 - (i) For planned CDM project activities:
 - Description of project activity;
 - Application of selected approved baseline and monitoring methodology;
 - Duration and crediting period;
 - (ii) For planned CDM PoAs:
 - General description of PoA;
 - Demonstration of additionality and development of eligibility criteria;
 - Duration of PoA;
 - General description of a generic CPA;
 - Application of a baseline and monitoring methodology.

48. The secretariat shall publish the schedules of the meetings of the methodological panel and working groups and the deadlines for the submission of requests for revision of an approved methodology or methodological tool to be considered by the relevant methodological panel or working group at the corresponding meeting. The relevant panel or working group shall make every effort to initiate the

**DRAFT**

consideration of the request at the meeting taking into account the priorities set by the chair of the panel or working group for that meeting.

2. Completeness check

49. The secretariat shall conduct a completeness check of the submission within seven (7) days of the deadline for submissions referred to in paragraph 48 above.

50. If the secretariat finds that the submission is incomplete, it shall request the proponent to submit the missing or revised documents and/or information. In this case, the proponent shall submit the requested documents and/or information to the secretariat within five (5) days of receipt of the request. If the proponent does not submit the requested documents and/or information by this deadline, the secretariat shall conclude that the submission is incomplete.

51. Upon conclusion of the completeness check, the secretariat shall notify the proponent of the conclusion of the completeness check. If the submission is concluded as incomplete in accordance with paragraph 50 above, the secretariat shall also communicate the underlying reasons to the proponent. In this case, the proponent may resubmit the proposed revised methodology or methodological tool with revised documentation at any time. Upon submission, the revised documentation shall be treated as a new submission of a request for revision of an approved methodology or methodological tool under this procedure.

3. Initial assessment

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

53. If, during the initial assessment, the secretariat identifies minor issues in the submission, it shall request the proponent to submit the missing or revised documents and/or information. In this case, the proponent shall submit the requested documents and/or information to the secretariat within five (5) days of receipt of the request. If the proponent does not submit the requested documents and/or information by this deadline, the secretariat shall conclude that the submission is incomplete.

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

55. If the submission is concluded as qualified for consideration by the relevant methodological panel or working group and the Board, the secretariat shall issue a unique reference number to the proposed revised methodology or methodological tool, and make the submission publicly available on the UNFCCC CDM website for global stakeholder consultation. The duration of the period for submission of comments for the global stakeholder consultation shall be 15 days. After this period, the secretariat shall make all comments received publicly available on the UNFCCC CDM website.

**DRAFT****4. Preparation of draft recommendation**

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

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

58. In preparing the draft recommendation, the secretariat may draw upon external expertise, depending on the technical complexity of the proposed revised methodology or methodological tool, by selecting a maximum of two (2) independent experts from the roster of experts referred to in paragraph 21 above to review the submission. If the secretariat does not find appropriate and available experts on the roster, it may use experts not included on the roster.

59. The secretariat shall select two (2) members of the relevant methodological panel or working group and forward the draft recommendation to them for their review. The selected members shall provide input on the draft recommendation within five (5) days of receipt of it.

60. The secretariat shall finalize the recommendation taking into account the input from the selected members of the relevant methodological panel or working group, and submit it to the panel or working group for consideration at its meeting in accordance with paragraph 48 above, at the latest seven (7) days before the meeting.

5. Consideration by panel or working group

61. The relevant methodological panel or working group shall consider the recommendation and prepare a draft recommendation to the Board. The panel or working group shall make every effort to conclude its consideration and finalize the recommendation to the Board within two (2) consecutive meetings. The recommendation to the Board shall be to either:

- (a) Approve the proposed revised methodology or methodological tool (“A case”); or
- (b) Reject the proposed revised methodology or methodological tool (“C case”).

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

63. If, in preparing the draft recommendation to the Board, the relevant methodological panel or working group identifies issues in the proposed revised methodology or methodological tool that may be addressed with clarifications or modifications, the panel or working group shall request the secretariat to communicate the issues to the proponent. In this case, the proponent shall provide clarifications or submit a modified proposed revised methodology or methodological tool to address the identified issues to the

**DRAFT**

secretariat within 28 days of the communication being made. If the proponent does not respond accordingly by this deadline, the panel or working group's submission of a final recommendation to the Board may be delayed accordingly. If the proponent does not respond accordingly within 90 days, the submission shall be considered withdrawn.

64. If the relevant methodological panel or working group's draft recommendation to the Board is to approve the proposed revised methodology or methodological tool, the secretariat shall communicate a reformatted revised methodology or methodological tool to the proponent. The proponent shall, within the time frame defined by the panel or working group, confirm that the reformatted revised methodology or methodological tool is acceptable or request modifications to it. If the proponent does not respond accordingly by this deadline, the panel or working group's submission of a final recommendation to the Board may be delayed accordingly.

65. The relevant methodological panel or working group shall finalize the recommendation to the Board taking into account the proponent's responses referred to in paragraphs 62 and 64 above, and publish it in its corresponding meeting report. The secretariat shall place the recommendation to the Board on the agenda of the next Board meeting.

6. Consideration by the Board

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

- (a) Approve the proposed revised methodology or methodological tool as recommended by the relevant methodological panel or working group, indicating:
 - (i) The revised methodology or methodological tool is for mandatory use; or
 - (ii) The revised methodology or methodological tool is for non-mandatory use;
- (b) Reject the proposed revised methodology or methodological tool; or
- (c) Request the relevant methodological panel or working group to review the recommendation to the Board and provide guidance on the issues for review.

67. If the Board approves the proposed revised methodology or methodological tool, the secretariat shall publish the approved revised methodology or methodological tool on the UNFCCC CDM website within seven (7) days of the approval.

7. Other

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

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

**DRAFT****B. Top-down process****1. Initiation**

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

- (a) Put on hold the approved methodology or methodological tool with immediate effect. In this case, DOEs shall not submit, through a dedicated interface on the UNFCCC CDM website, any PDD or PoA-DD for global stakeholder consultation, any request for registration or any request for renewal of crediting period of a project activity or PoA applying the methodology or methodological tool from the day following the date of publication of the Board's meeting report containing the decision; [or]
- (b) [Put on hold the approved methodology or methodological tool with a grace period of 28 days. In this case, DOEs shall not submit, through a dedicated interface on the UNFCCC CDM website, any PDD or PoA-DD for global stakeholder consultation, any request for registration or any request for renewal of crediting period of a project activity or PoA, applying the methodology or methodological tool any more than 28 days following the date of publication of the Board's meeting report containing the decision; or]
- (c) Maintain the current version of the approved methodology or methodological tool until the expiry of its validity in accordance with paragraphs 82–84 below.

71. A methodological panel or working group, or the secretariat, may, taking into account the appendix to this procedure, propose that the Board revise an approved methodology or methodological tool at any time. In this case, the Board shall consider the proposal and decide whether to revise the methodology or methodological tool in accordance with paragraph 70 above.

2. Preparation of draft revised methodology or methodological tool

72. If the Board decides to revise an approved methodology or methodological tool in accordance with paragraph 70 or 71 above, the secretariat shall prepare a draft revised methodology or methodological tool using the form "Approved baseline and monitoring methodology/methodological tool revision form" (F-CDM-AMR-D).

73. In preparing the draft revised methodology or methodological tool, the secretariat may draw upon external expertise, depending on the technical complexity of the revision, by selecting a maximum of two (2) independent experts from the roster of experts referred to in paragraph 21 above, to review the draft revised methodology or methodological tool. If the secretariat does not find appropriate and available experts on the roster, it may use experts not included on the roster.

74. The secretariat shall select two (2) members of the relevant methodological panel or working group and forward the draft revised methodology or methodological tool to them for their review. The selected members shall provide input on the draft revised methodology or methodological tool within five (5) days of receipt of it.

75. The secretariat shall finalize the draft revised methodology or methodological tool taking into account the input from the selected members of the relevant methodological panel or working group, and submit it to the panel or working group for consideration at its meeting, at the latest seven (7) days before the meeting.

**DRAFT****3. Consideration by panel or working group**

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

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

78. The relevant methodological panel or working group shall finalize the recommendation to the Board on the draft revised methodology or methodological tool taking into account the comments received in the global stakeholder consultation, and publish it in its corresponding meeting report. The secretariat shall place the recommendation to the Board on the agenda of the next Board meeting.

4. Consideration by the Board

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

- (a) Approve the proposed revised methodology or methodological tool, indicating:
 - (i) The revision is for mandatory use; or
 - (ii) The revision is for non-mandatory use;
- (b) Reject the proposed revised methodology or methodological tool; or
- (c) Request the relevant methodological panel or working group to review the recommendation to the Board and provide guidance on the issues for review.

80. If the Board approves the proposed revised methodology or methodological tool, the secretariat shall publish the approved revised methodology or methodological tool on the UNFCCC CDM website within seven (7) days of the approval.

5. Other

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

VI. Validity of new, revised and previous versions

82. An approved new or revised methodology or methodological tool shall be effective from the date of publication on the UNFCCC CDM website. From this date, a project activity or PoA may apply the new or revised version for the purpose of publication of a PDD or PoA-DD for global stakeholder consultation, submission of a request for registration, or submission of a request for renewal of crediting period, in accordance with the “Clean development mechanism project cycle procedure”.

**DRAFT**

83. If the Board approves a revised methodology or methodological tool indicating that it is for mandatory use in accordance with paragraph 66(a)(i) or 79(a)(i) above, the version number of the methodology or methodological tool shall increase by one whole number (e.g. from 1.0 to 2.0), and the previous version shall continue to be valid for 240 days from the date that the revised version becomes effective unless the previous version has been put on hold by the Board in accordance with paragraph 70(a) [or 70(b) above]. In this case, for the purpose of publication of a PDD or PoA-DD for global stakeholder consultation, submission of a request for registration, or submission of a request for renewal of crediting period in accordance with the “Clean development mechanism project cycle procedure”:

- (a) A project activity or PoA may still apply the previous version during this 240-day period unless the previous version has been put on hold by the Board in accordance with paragraph 70(a) [or 70(b) above]; and
- (b) A project activity or PoA shall apply the revised version after this 240-day period, or immediately after its adoption if the previous version has been put on hold in accordance with paragraph 70(a) [or 70(b) above]. If a PDD or PoA-DD applying the previous version has already been published for global stakeholder consultation, the project participants or coordinating/managing entity shall revise the PDD or PoA-DD applying the revised version. In this case, the DOE shall not publish the revised PDD or PoA-DD for global stakeholder consultation, but submit it when it submits a request for registration unless otherwise decided by the Board when it approves the revised methodology or methodological tool.

84. If the Board approves a revised methodology or methodological tool indicating that it is for non-mandatory use in accordance with paragraph 66(a)(ii) or 79(a)(ii) above, or if an editorial revision to an approved methodology or methodological tool has been made in accordance with paragraph 81 above, the version number of the methodology or methodological tool shall increase by one fractional number (e.g. from 1.0 to 1.1), and the previous version shall continue to be valid until the next revision for mandatory use. In this case, for the purpose of publication of a PDD or PoA-DD for global stakeholder consultation, submission of a request for registration, or submission of a request for renewal of crediting period in accordance with the “Clean development mechanism project cycle procedure”, a project activity or PoA may still apply the previous version or any earlier version until the end of the 240-day period after the next revision for mandatory use, provided that there was no revision for mandatory use in between.

85. If the Board approves a new or revised consolidated methodology or methodological tool, and the (latest) consolidation involves an approved methodology or methodological tool, the methodology or methodological tool that has been consolidated shall continue to be valid for 240 days from the date when the consolidated methodology or methodological tool becomes effective unless the methodology or methodological tool that has been consolidated has been put on hold by the Board in accordance with paragraph 70(a) [or 70(b) above]. In this case, for the purpose of publication of a PDD or PoA-DD for global stakeholder consultation, submission of a request for registration, or submission of a request for renewal of crediting period in accordance with the “Clean development mechanism project cycle procedure” :

- (a) A project activity or PoA may still apply the methodology or methodological tool that has been consolidated during this 240-day period unless it has been put on hold by the Board in accordance with paragraph 70(a) [or 70(b) above]; and
- (b) A project activity or PoA shall apply the consolidated methodology or methodological tool after this 240-day period, or immediately after its adoption if the methodology or

**DRAFT**

methodological tool that has been consolidated has been put on hold in accordance with paragraph 70(a) [or 70(b) above]. If a PDD or PoA-DD applying the methodology or methodological tool that has been consolidated has already been published for global stakeholder consultation, the project participants or coordinating/managing entity shall revise the PDD or PoA-DD applying the consolidated methodology. In this case, the DOE shall not publish the revised PDD or PoA-DD for global stakeholder consultation, but submit it when it submits a request for registration unless otherwise decided by the Board when it approves the revised methodology or methodological tool.

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

VII. Clarification of approved methodology or methodological tool**A. Bottom-up process****1. Submission of request for clarification**

87. [The project participants of a planned CDM project activity or PoA, the coordinating/managing entity of a planned CDM PoA, or a DOE] [The project participants of a planned CDM project activity or PoA, the coordinating/managing entity of a planned CDM PoA, a DOE, a DNA or any other stakeholder] (hereinafter in section VI.A. referred to as the enquirer) may request clarification of an approved methodology or methodological tool, by submitting, through a specific interface on the UNFCCC CDM website, the following documents to the secretariat the duly completed “Approved baseline and monitoring methodology/methodological tool clarification request form” (F-CDM-AMC).

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

2. Completeness check

89. The secretariat shall conduct a completeness check of the submission within seven (7) days of the deadline for submissions referred to in paragraph 88 above.

90. 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 (5) days of receipt of the request. If the enquirer does not submit the requested documents and/or information by this deadline, the secretariat shall conclude that the submission is incomplete.

91. Upon conclusion of the completeness check, the secretariat shall notify the enquirer of the conclusion of the completeness check. If the submission is concluded as incomplete in accordance with paragraph 90 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

**DRAFT**

submission, the revised documentation shall be treated as a new submission of a request for clarification under this procedure.

3. Initial assessment

92. Upon positive conclusion of the completeness check, the secretariat shall conduct an initial assessment of the submission using the form “Approved baseline and monitoring methodology/methodological tool clarification request initial assessment form” (F-CDM-AMC-IA) within 30 days of the deadline for submissions referred to in paragraph 88 above, to determine either that:

- (a) It does not involve any regulatory and/or technical ambiguity, hence requires no analysis to formulate a clarification;
- (b) It involves simple regulatory and/or technical issues, hence requires a simple analysis to formulate a clarification; or
- (c) It involves complex regulatory and/or technical issues, hence requires a thorough analysis to formulate a clarification.

4. Super-fast track

93. If the submission is determined as being the case referred to in paragraph 92(a) above, the secretariat shall prepare a clarification using the form “Approved baseline and monitoring methodology/methodological tool clarification response form” (F-CDM-AMC-R) and send it to the enquirer within 30 days of the deadline for submissions referred to in paragraph 88 above.

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

5. Fast track

95. If the submission is determined as being the case referred to in paragraph 92(b) above, the secretariat shall prepare a draft clarification using the form “Approved baseline and monitoring methodology/methodological tool clarification response form” (F-CDM-AMC-R).

96. The secretariat shall select two (2) members of the relevant methodological panel or working group and forward the draft clarification to them for their review. The selected members shall provide input on the draft clarification within three (3) days of receipt of it.

97. The secretariat shall finalize the clarification taking into account the input from the selected members of the relevant methodological panel or working group, and send it to the enquirer within 45 days of the deadline for submissions referred to in paragraph 88 above.

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

6. Regular track

99. If the submission is determined as being the case referred to in paragraph 92(c) above, the secretariat shall prepare a draft recommendation of a clarification to the relevant methodological panel or working group using the form “Approved baseline and monitoring methodology/methodological tool clarification response form” (F-CDM-AMC-R).

100. In preparing the draft recommendation, the secretariat may draw upon external expertise, depending on the technical complexity of the issues in question, by selecting a maximum of two (2)

**DRAFT**

independent experts from the roster of experts referred to in paragraph 21 above to review the submission. If the secretariat does not find appropriate and available experts on the roster, it may use experts not included on the roster.

101. The secretariat shall select one (1) member of the relevant methodological panel or working group and forward the draft recommendation to him/her for review. The selected member shall provide input on the draft recommendation within three (3) days of receipt of it.

102. The secretariat shall finalize the recommendation taking into account the input from the selected member, and submit it to the relevant methodological panel or working group for consideration at its meeting in accordance with paragraph 88 above, at the latest seven (7) days before the meeting.

103. The relevant methodological panel or working group shall consider the recommendation, finalize the clarification and refer to it in its corresponding meeting report. The panel or working group shall make every effort to finalize the clarification within one (1) meeting.

104. The secretariat shall send the finalized clarification to the enquirer.

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

7. Other

106. The secretariat shall maintain a publicly available list of all requests for clarification that have been concluded as complete in accordance with paragraphs 89–91 above, on the UNFCCC website, indicating the current status in the process.

107. At any step before the clarification is finalized in accordance with paragraph 93, 97 or 103 above, the secretariat may request the enquirer to provide additional information regarding the request for clarification within a defined time frame to facilitate the assessment by the secretariat and/or the consideration by the relevant methodological panel or working group. If such information significantly affects the outcome of the consideration, the secretariat shall make the information publicly available on the UNFCCC CDM website.

B. Top-down process

108. If the Board, a relevant methodological panel or working group, or the secretariat finds it necessary to clarify provisions of an approved methodology or methodological tool, the process to revise the methodology or methodological tool as defined in section V. B. above shall be followed.

**DRAFT****Appendix: Principles for revision and consolidation of methodologies****I. Background**

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

II. Principles for revision

2. A revision is the modification of an approved methodology or methodological tool in order to improve it or broaden its scope and applicability.
3. A revision of an approved methodology or methodological tool may be carried out if one or more of the following conditions are considered to apply:
- (a) New or better understanding of scientific evidence indicates that emission reductions or removal enhancements may be overestimated or underestimated based on the approved methodology or methodological tool or that the reductions or enhancements may not be real, measurable and verifiable;
 - (b) The applicability conditions require broadening to include more potential project activity types or conditions for use;
 - (c) There are identified inconsistencies, errors and/or ambiguities in the language and/or formulae used within or between methodologies or methodological tools;
 - (d) There is scope for simplification and/or more clarification in order to improve its user-friendliness, or to incorporate clarifications on the approved methodology or methodological tool that have already been provided by the Board or the secretariat in response to requests for clarification of the approved methodology or methodological tool in accordance with section VI. A. of this procedure.

III. Principles for consolidation

4. The aims of consolidating methodologies or methodological tools are to: (a) make a set of approved methodologies or methodological tools more concise and user-friendly; and (b) avoid possible inconsistencies between methodologies or methodological tools. Consolidation results in the issuance of a new or revised approved consolidated methodology or methodological tool.
5. A consolidation of two or more proposed new, proposed revised and/or approved methodologies or methodological tools into a single methodology or methodological tool may be carried out if:
- (a) These methodologies or methodological tools are similar in many of their core components (e.g. applicability, approach, technology, measure, baseline determination, demonstration of additionality, or emission calculation); and
 - (b) A new consolidated methodology or methodological tool can be drafted on the basis of these methodologies or methodological tools, which will be applicable to all the project activities and PoAs that apply at least one of these methodologies or methodological tools.

**DRAFT**

6. A consolidated methodology or methodological tool may also include elements from other proposed new, proposed revised or approved methodologies or methodological tools that are not part of the consolidation.
7. In consolidating methodologies or methodological tools, a balance has to be made between reducing the number of methodologies or methodological tools available to project participants and coordinating/managing entities in the database, and the complexity of the methodologies and the methodological tools, in order to keep the database of methodologies and methodological tools lean and concise.
8. If a consolidated methodology or methodological tool involves an approved methodology or methodological tool, and the consolidated one fully covers the approved one having been consolidated, then the consolidated one supersedes the approved one.
9. If the range of applicability conditions of a consolidated methodology or methodological tool does not fully cover the combined range of applicability conditions of the approved methodologies or methodological tools that have been consolidated, then the original methodologies or methodological tools are not withdrawn, but revised so that their ranges of applicability conditions are limited to the project activity types for which the consolidated methodology is not applicable. In this case, the consolidation and the revision are carried out simultaneously.

**DRAFT****History of the document**

Version	Date	Nature of revision(s)
01.0	27 August 2012	<p>Initial publication as an annex to the annotated agenda of EB69. This document supersedes the following documents on the date when this document enters into force:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Procedure for the submission and consideration of a proposed new baseline and monitoring methodology for large scale CDM project activities (version 01)• Procedure for the submission and consideration of a proposed new small scale methodology (version 03)• Procedure for the submission and consideration of a proposed new baseline and monitoring methodology for large scale afforestation and reforestation CDM project activities (version 01)• Procedure for the submission and consideration of a proposed new baseline and monitoring methodology for carbon capture and storage CDM project activities (version 01.0)• Procedure for the submission and consideration of requests for revision of approved baseline and monitoring methodologies and tools for large scale CDM project activities (version 01)• Procedure for the revision of an approved small scale methodology by the Executive Board (version 01)• Procedure for the submission and consideration of requests for revision of approved baseline and monitoring methodologies and tools for A/R CDM project activities (version 01)• Guidance on criteria for consolidations and revision of methodologies• Procedure for the submission and consideration of queries regarding the application of approved methodologies and methodological tools by designated operational entities to the Meth Panel (version 06)• Procedure for the submission and consideration of request for clarification on the application of approved small scale methodologies (version 01)
Decision Class: Regulatory Document Type: Procedure Business Function: Methodology		