

CDM-EB70-AA-A16

Draft Procedure

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

Version 03.0

DRAFT



United Nations
Framework Convention on
Climate Change

COVER NOTE

1. Procedural background

1. The attached draft procedure 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 procedure was presented to the Board at its sixty-eighth meeting. Prior to the Board meeting, the concept note was discussed with stakeholders at the CDM roundtable held on 10 August 2012.
3. A draft procedure prepared taking into account the inputs provided by the Board and the stakeholders was presented to the Board at its sixty-ninth meeting.
4. A call for public input was held on the draft procedure prepared taking into account the inputs from the Board at its sixty-ninth meeting.

2. Purpose

5. 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.

3. Key issues and proposed solutions

6. Key issues and proposed solutions for the Board’s consideration are:
 - (a) **Charging of fees:** The Board, at its sixty-ninth meeting, provided guidance that the fee payment for proposing a new methodology is to be limited to submissions from stakeholders other than project participants, coordinating/managing entities, DOEs and DNAs. However, such a rule is hard to implement as it is difficult in practice to distinguish potential project participants or coordinating/managing entities from these “other stakeholders”, considering that all proposals should accompany a PDD or PoA-DD;

- (b) **Top-down revision process:** Based on the Board's guidance at its sixty-ninth meeting, the draft procedure has been modified so that the relevant methodological panel or working group may initiate the revision of a methodology or methodological tool without prior agreement by the Board. However, to ensure such action is in line with the Board's management plan, a text has been added so that the panel, working group or the secretariat shall report the initiation of the revision with justification to the Board for endorsement at its next meeting;
- (c) **Validity of new, revised and previous versions:** A provision has been added clarifying that, for the purpose of publication of a monitoring report or submission of a request for issuance, the version of the methodology or methodological tool that the project activity or PoA has been registered with shall be applied;
- (d) **Clarification process:** Based on the Board's guidance at its sixty-ninth meeting, the draft procedure has been modified so that: 1) there are now two tracks ("fast track" and "regular track") being proposed instead of the three tracks that had been proposed in the previous draft; and 2) all cases under the regular track will be brought to the Board, which will approve the clarification recommended by the relevant panel or working group, before sending the clarification to the enquirer;
- (e) **Implementation plan:** Considering the time required to prepare for various forms referred to in the draft procedure and modify the IT workflow to support the new processes, it is recommended to make the procedure effective as of 1 April 2013.

4. Impacts

- 7. Project participants and coordinating/managing entities that 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, or clarifications).
- 8. Other stakeholders would also benefit from the transparency of the process in particular the top-down process.
- 9. The CDM process as a whole would benefit from having a consistent level of robustness of methodologies and methodological tools.

5. Proposed work and timelines

- 10. It is proposed that:
 - (a) The Board adopts the procedure after modifying this draft as appropriate;
 - (b) The Board agrees on the implementation plan, and requests the secretariat to start implementing the procedure accordingly.

6. Recommendations to the Board

- 11. The secretariat recommends that the Board adopts the attached draft procedure and agrees with the proposed plan for implementation of the procedure.

7. References

12. The procedure, once implemented, replaces the following regulatory documents:

- (a) "Procedure for the submission and consideration of a proposed new baseline and monitoring methodology for large scale CDM project activities (version 01)";
- (b) "Procedure for the submission and consideration of a proposed new small scale methodology (version 03)";
- (c) "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)";
- (d) "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)";
- (e) "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)";
- (f) "Procedure for the revision of an approved small scale methodology by the Executive Board (version 01)";
- (g) "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)";
- (h) "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)";
- (i) "Procedure for the submission and consideration of request for clarification on the application of approved small scale methodologies (version 01)";
- (j) "Guidance on criteria for consolidations and revision of methodologies";
- (k) "Clarification for project participants on when to request a revision, clarification to an approved methodology or deviation (version 02)".

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

6.1.4.	Preparation of draft recommendation	17
6.1.5.	Consideration by panel or working group	18
6.1.6.	Consideration by the Board.....	19
6.1.7.	Other	19
6.2.	Top-down process	19
6.2.1.	Initiation	19
6.2.2.	Preparation of draft revised methodology or methodological tool	20
6.2.3.	Consideration by panel or working group	20
6.2.4.	Consideration by the Board.....	21
6.2.5.	Other	21
7.	VALIDITY OF NEW, REVISED AND PREVIOUS VERSIONS	21
8.	CLARIFICATION OF APPROVED METHODOLOGY OR METHODOLOGICAL TOOL	24
8.1.	Bottom-up process.....	24
8.1.1.	Submission of request for clarification	24
8.1.2.	Completeness check	24
8.1.3.	Initial assessment.....	24
8.1.4.	Super-f Fast track.....	25
8.1.5.	Fast track.....	25
8.1.5.	Regular track	26
8.1.6.	Other	26
8.2.	Top-down process	27
Appendix 1.	Principles for revision and, consolidation and clarification of methodologies	28

1. Introduction

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.~~

2. Scope, applicability, and entry into force

2.1. Scope

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:
 7. 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 methodologies, proposed revised methodologies and methodological tools, and requests for clarification on approved methodologies and methodological tools;
 8. 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;
 9. Enhance the overall efficiency and integrity of the CDM.
5. 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, defines the processes for the development of new methodologies and methodological tools, for the revision of approved methodologies and methodological tools, and for the provisioning of clarifications of approved methodologies and methodological tools.

2.2. Applicability

6. This procedure applies to:
 - (a) All “bottom-up”¹ cases for the development of new methodologies, and all “top-down”² cases for the development of new methodologies and methodological tools;
 - (b) All “bottom-up” and “top-down” cases for the revision of approved methodologies and methodological tools;
 - (c) All “bottom-up” and “top-down” cases for the provision of clarifications of approved methodologies and methodological tools;
7. This procedure does not apply to clarification requests on standards or guidelines on methodologies. Such requests shall be submitted and processed under the “Modalities and procedures for direct communication with stakeholders”.

¹ In this document, “bottom-up” means that project participants of project activities, coordinating/managing entities of PoAs, designated operational entities (DOEs) or other stakeholders initiate the process by submitting a proposal or a request to the secretariat.

² In this document, “top-down” means that the Board, the relevant methodological panel or working group, or the secretariat initiates the process.

2.3. Entry into force

8. This procedure shall be effective from 1 April 2013.

3. Normative references

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

- (a) "Clean development mechanism project cycle procedure";
- (b) "Glossary of CDM terms".

4. Definitions

10. 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.

5. Development of new methodology or methodological tool

5.1. Bottom-up process

5.1.1. Submission of proposed new methodology

11. The secretariat shall publish the schedules of the meetings of the methodological panel and working groups (the Methodologies Panel, the Small-Scale Working Group, the Afforestation and Reforestation Working Group, and the 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.
12. 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 5.1 referred to as the proponent) may propose a new methodology to the Board by submitting, through a dedicated specific 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;

- (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 ~~the~~ relevant PDD or PoA-DD 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, **applying the proposed new methodology**:
- (i) For planned CDM project activities:
 - a. Description of project activity;
 - b. Application of selected approved baseline and monitoring methodology;
 - c. Duration and crediting period;
 - (ii) For planned CDM PoAs:
 - a. General description of PoA;
 - b. Demonstration of additionality and development of eligibility criteria;
 - c. Duration of PoA;
 - d. General description of a generic CPA;
 - e. Application of a baseline and monitoring methodology.
13. [A fee of USD 1,000 shall be payable for each submission of a proposal of a new methodology ~~or methodological tool~~ from a proponent other than the project participants, **the coordinating/managing entity, a DOE, or a DNA. In this case, if the fee is not paid by the deadline referred to in paragraph 11 above, the submission shall not be regarded as has being received by the deadline.**]

5.1.2. Completeness check

14. The secretariat shall conduct a completeness check of the submission within seven ~~(7)~~ days of the deadline for submissions referred to in paragraph 11 above.
15. 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.
16. 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 15 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.

5.1.3. Initial assessment

17. 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 11 above, to determine whether the submission qualifies for consideration by the relevant methodological panel or working group and the Board.
18. 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.
19. 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 18 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.
20. 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~~the comments received publicly available on the UNFCCC CDM website.

5.1.4. Preparation of draft recommendation

21. 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).
22. 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/developed~~ under this procedure. In this case, the subsequent paragraphs in section 5.1 shall apply mutatis mutandis.
23. 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/suitable~~ and available experts on the roster, it may use ~~the services of~~ experts not included on the roster.

24. 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.
25. 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 11 above, at the latest seven ~~(7)~~ days before the meeting.

5.1.5. Consideration by panel or working group

26. 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").
27. 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~~ ~~developed~~ under this procedure. In this case, the subsequent paragraphs in section 5.1 shall apply mutatis mutandis.
28. 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.
29. 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.
30. 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 28 and 29 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.

5.1.6. Consideration by the Board

31. 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.
32. 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.

5.1.7. Other

33. 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.
34. 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.

5.2. Top-down process

5.2.1. Initiation

35. The Board may decide to develop a new methodology (including a new consolidated methodology) or methodological tool at any time.
36. 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.

5.2.2. Preparation of draft new methodology or methodological tool

37. If the Board decides to develop a new methodology or methodological tool in accordance with paragraph 35 or 36 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.
38. 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.

39. 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.
40. 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 accordance with~~ the development plan.
41. 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 23 above, to review the draft new methodology or methodological tool. If the secretariat does not find ~~appropriate~~ suitable and available experts on the roster, it may use ~~the services of~~ experts not included on the roster.
42. 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.
43. 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.

5.2.3. Consideration by panel or working group

44. 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.
45. 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.
46. 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.

5.2.4. Consideration by the Board

47. 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.
48. 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.

6. Revision of approved methodology or methodological tool

6.1. Bottom-up process

6.1.1. Submission of proposed revised methodology or methodological tool

49. The secretariat shall publish the schedules of the meetings of the methodological 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 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.
50. 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 6.1 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 specific** 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 **the relevant PDD or PoA-DD 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, **applying the proposed revised methodology or methodological tool**:
 - (i) For planned CDM project activities:
 - a. Description of project activity;
 - b. Application of selected approved baseline and monitoring methodology;

- c. Duration and crediting period;
- (ii) For planned CDM PoAs:
 - a. General description of PoA;
 - b. Demonstration of additionality and development of eligibility criteria;
 - c. Duration of PoA;
 - d. General description of a generic CPA;
 - e. Application of a baseline and monitoring methodology.

51. A request for revision of an approved methodology or methodological tool shall not include proposed changes to the methodology or methodological tool that would result in the exclusion, restriction or narrowing of the applicability conditions of the methodology or methodological tool for other project activities or PoAs. To propose such changes to an approved methodology, the proponent shall propose a new methodology in accordance with section 5.1 above. If a request for revision of an approved methodology is likely to result in the addition of new procedures or scenarios to more than half of the provisions of the methodology, the proponent should propose a new methodology in accordance with section 5.1 above.

6.1.2. Completeness check

52. The secretariat shall conduct a completeness check of the submission within seven ~~(7)~~ days of the deadline for submissions referred to in paragraph 49 above.
53. If the secretariat finds that the submission is incomplete, it shall request the proponent to submit the missing or revised documents and/or information. In this case, the proponent shall submit the requested documents and/or information to the secretariat within five ~~(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 completeness check, the secretariat shall notify the proponent of the conclusion of the completeness check. If the submission is concluded as incomplete in accordance with paragraph 53 above, the secretariat shall also communicate the underlying 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.

6.1.3. Initial assessment

55. Upon positive conclusion of the completeness check, the secretariat shall conduct an initial assessment of the submission using the “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 49 above, to determine whether the submission qualifies for consideration by the relevant methodological panel or working group and the Board.

56. If, during the initial assessment, the secretariat identifies minor issues in the submission, it shall request the proponent to submit the missing or revised documents and/or information. In this case, the proponent shall submit the requested documents and/or information to the secretariat within five ~~(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.
57. Upon conclusion of the initial assessment, the secretariat shall notify the proponent of the conclusion of the initial assessment. If the submission is concluded as unqualified for consideration, or incomplete in accordance with paragraph 56 above, the secretariat shall also communicate the underlying 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.
58. 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.

6.1.4. Preparation of draft recommendation

59. 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).
60. In preparing the draft recommendation, the secretariat may, taking into account the appendix to this procedure, propose that a new or revised consolidated methodology be prepared covering the scope and applicability of the proposed revised methodology, by merging it with an approved methodology or other ~~proposed~~ ~~currently~~ being ~~processed~~ ~~developed~~ under this procedure. In this case, the subsequent paragraphs in section 6.1 shall apply mutatis mutandis.
61. In preparing the draft recommendation, the secretariat may draw upon external expertise, depending on the technical complexity of the proposed revised methodology or methodological tool, by selecting a maximum of two ~~(2)~~ independent experts from the roster of experts referred to in paragraph 23 above to review the submission. If the secretariat does not find ~~appropriate~~ ~~suitable~~ and available experts on the roster, it may use ~~the services of~~ experts not included on the roster.
62. The secretariat shall select two ~~(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.

63. 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 49 above, at the latest seven ~~(7)~~ days before the meeting.

6.1.5. Consideration by panel or working group

64. 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").
65. 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~~ **developed** under this procedure. In this case, the subsequent paragraphs in section 6.1 shall apply mutatis mutandis.
66. 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 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.
67. 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.
68. 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 66 and 67 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.

6.1.6. Consideration by the Board

69. 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 that:
 - (i) The revised methodology or methodological tool is for mandatory use; revision is a major revision; or
 - (ii) The revised methodology or methodological tool is for non-mandatory use; revision is a minor revision;
 - (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.
70. 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.

6.1.7. Other

71. 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.
72. 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.

6.2. Top-down process

6.2.1. Initiation

73. The Board may, taking into account the appendix to this procedure, decide to revise an approved methodology (including an approved consolidated methodology) or methodological tool at any time. 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; ~~for~~

- (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 85–88 below.
74. A methodological panel or working group, or the secretariat, may, taking into account the appendix to this procedure, ~~propose that the Board initiate~~ **revise** the revision of an approved methodology (including an approved consolidated methodology) or methodological tool at any time. If the panel or working group, or the secretariat initiates the revision of an approved methodology, it shall report it with justification to the Board for endorsement at its next meeting. If the panel or working group or the secretariat considers that the current version of the methodology or methodological tool should be put on hold, it shall recommend so to the Board. In this case, the Board shall consider the ~~proposal~~ **recommendation** and decide whether to ~~revise~~ **put on hold** the methodology or methodological tool in accordance with paragraph 73 above.

6.2.2. Preparation of draft revised methodology or methodological tool

75. If the Board, **a methodological panel or working group, or the secretariat**, decides to revise an approved methodology or methodological tool in accordance with paragraph 73 or 74 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).
76. 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 23 above, to review the draft revised methodology or methodological tool. If the secretariat does not find **appropriate** ~~suitable~~ and available experts on the roster, it may use **the services of** experts not included on the roster.
77. 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.
78. 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.

6.2.3. Consideration by panel or working group

79. 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.

80. 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.
81. 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.

6.2.4. Consideration by the Board

82. 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 that:
 - (i) The revision is ~~for mandatory use~~ a major revision; or
 - (ii) The revision is ~~for non-mandatory use~~ a minor revision;
 - (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.
83. 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.

6.2.5. Other

84. 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.

7. Validity of new, revised and previous versions

85. 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".

86. If the Board approves a revised methodology or methodological tool indicating that it is ~~for mandatory use~~ **a major revision** in accordance with paragraph 69(a)(i) or 82(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 73(a) ~~or 73(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 73(a) ~~or 73(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 73(a) ~~or 73(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.
87. If the Board approves a revised methodology or methodological tool indicating that it is ~~for non-mandatory use~~ **a minor revision** in accordance with paragraph 69(a)(ii) or 82(a)(ii) above, or if an editorial revision to an approved methodology or methodological tool has been made in accordance with paragraph 84 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 **major revision for mandatory use**, ~~provided that there was no revision for mandatory use in between.~~

88. 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 approved methodology or methodological tool that has been consolidated shall continue to be valid for 240 days from the date when the consolidated methodology or methodological tool becomes effective unless the approved methodology or methodological tool that has been consolidated has been put on hold by the Board in accordance with paragraph 73(a) ~~for~~ 73(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 73(a) ~~for~~ 73(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 methodological tool that has been consolidated has been put on hold in accordance with paragraph 73(a) ~~for~~ 73(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.
89. For the purpose of publication of a monitoring report and submission of a request for issuance, a project activity or PoA shall apply the version of the methodology or methodological tool that the project activity or PoA has been registered with. If the project participants or coordinating/managing entity wish to use a later version of the methodology or methodological tool for the purpose of monitoring of emission reductions or removals after the registration of the project activity or PoA, or a DOE, when performing a verification, determines that permanent changes to the monitoring plan as described in the registered PDD or PoA-DD, generic CPA-DD, or the monitoring methodology have occurred or expected to occur, the DOE shall submit a request for approval by the Board prior to the submission of the request for issuance in accordance with the relevant provisions of the “Clean development mechanism project cycle procedure”.
90. 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.

8. Clarification of approved methodology or methodological tool

8.1. Bottom-up process

8.1.1. Submission of request for clarification

91. 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.
92. ~~[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 8.1 referred to as the enquirer) may, taking into account the appendix to this procedure, request clarification of an approved methodology or methodological tool, by submitting, through a specific interface on the UNFCCC CDM website, the following documents to the secretariat the duly completed “Approved baseline and monitoring methodology/methodological tool clarification request form” (F-CDM-AMC) to the secretariat.

8.1.2. Completeness check

93. The secretariat shall conduct a completeness check of the submission within seven ~~(7)~~ days of the deadline for submissions referred to in paragraph 91 above .
94. 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.
95. 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 94 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.

8.1.3. Initial assessment

96. 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 3015 days of the deadline for submissions referred to in paragraph 91 above, to determine either that:

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

8.1.4. Super-fFast track

- 97. If the submission is determined as being the case referred to in paragraph 96(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 91 above.
- 98. In preparing the clarification, the secretariat may consult with the relevant methodological panel or working group. In this case, the timeline referred to in paragraph 97 above shall not apply. The secretariat shall send a draft clarification to the panel or working group within 30 days of the deadline for submissions referred to in paragraph 91 above. If no member of the panel or working group objects to the draft clarification within seven days of receipt of the draft clarification, the clarification shall be deemed finalized by the panel or working group. If a member of the panel or working group objects to the draft clarification, the case shall be placed on the agenda of the next meeting of the panel or working group. At the meeting where the case is placed on the agenda, the panel or working group shall make every effort to finalize the clarification within one meeting.
- 99. The secretariat shall publish the clarification on the UNFCCC CDM website.

~~9.1.5. Fast track~~

- ~~100. If the submission is determined as being the case referred to in paragraph 96(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).~~
- ~~101. 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.~~
- ~~102. 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.~~
- ~~103. The secretariat shall publish the clarification on the UNFCCC CDM website.~~

8.1.5. Regular track

100. If the submission is determined as being the case referred to in paragraph 96(b) 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).
101. 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)~~ independent experts from the roster of experts referred to in paragraph 23 above to review the submission. If the secretariat does not find appropriate suitable and available experts on the roster, it may use the services of experts not included on the roster.
102. 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.
103. 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 91 above, at the latest seven ~~(7)~~ days before the meeting.
104. The relevant methodological panel or working group shall consider the recommendation, finalize the ~~clarification recommendation to the Board~~ and ~~refer to publish~~ it in its corresponding meeting report. The panel or working group shall make every effort to finalize the ~~clarification recommendation~~ within one ~~(1)~~ meeting.
105. 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 recommended clarification; or
 - (b) Request the relevant methodological panel or working group to review the recommendation to the Board and provide guidance on the issues for review.
106. If the Board approves the clarification, ~~the~~ the secretariat shall send the finalized clarification to the enquirer.
107. The secretariat shall publish the clarification on the UNFCCC CDM website.

8.1.6. Other

108. The secretariat shall maintain a publicly available list of all requests for clarification that have been concluded as complete in accordance with paragraphs 93–95 above, on the UNFCCC website, indicating the current status in the process.
109. At any step before the clarification is finalized in accordance with paragraph 97 or 105(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 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.

8.2. Top-down process

110. 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 6.2 above shall be followed. In this case, the revised methodology or methodological tool shall incorporate all relevant clarifications issued prior to the revision.

DRAFT

Appendix 1. Principles for revision~~—and~~, consolidation and clarification of methodologies

1. 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, and for initiating a (request for) clarification of an approved methodology or methodological tool.

2. Principles for revision

2. A revision is the modification of an approved methodology or methodological tool in order to improve it or broaden its scope and applicability.
3. A revision of an approved methodology or methodological tool may be carried out if one or more of the following conditions ~~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;¹
 - (c) There are identified inconsistencies, errors and/or ambiguities in the language and/or formulae used within or between methodologies or methodological tools;
 - (d) 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 8.1 of this procedure.

3. Principles for consolidation

4. The aims of consolidating methodologies or methodological tools are to: (a) make a set of approved methodologies or methodological tools more concise and user-friendly; and (b) avoid possible inconsistencies between methodologies or methodological tools.

¹ A request for revision is suitable for situations where an approved methodology or methodological tool is not applicable to a project activity or PoA but the project activity or PoA is broadly similar to the project activities or PoAs to which the approved methodology is applicable. Similarity is based on the nature (technology/measure) of the project activity or PoA and the sources of the emissions affected by the project activity or PoA. For example, an approved methodology may not be applicable as the sources of emissions affected by the project activity are the same as those in the methodology but the technology/measure used in the project activity is not covered under the applicability conditions; or the procedures provided in the methodology for estimating emissions from sources are not applicable because of slight variations in the approach, flow of events or structure chosen in the project activity.

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.
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.

4. Principles for clarification

10. A clarification on an approved methodology or methodological tool is to clarify:

- (a) The applicability of the methodology or methodological tool to a specific (planned) CDM project activity or PoA;
- (b) Various procedures provided in the methodology or methodological tool, inter alia, for identifying the baseline scenario, demonstrating additionality, estimating baseline emissions, project emissions and leakage; or
- (c) Monitoring data and procedures.

- - - - -

Document information

Version	Date	Description
03.0	5 November 2012	<p>Publication as an annex to the annotated agenda of EB70. This document takes into account input from the call for public input conducted from 26 September to 23 October 2012, in particular the involvement of the entire panel or working group members in the regular track of the clarification process. This version also incorporates editorial improvement.</p>
02.0	15 September 2012	<p>Publication for global stakeholder consultation. This version of draft incorporates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarifications for project participants on when to request revision, clarification to an approved methodology or a deviation (version 02) • The Board's guidance at EB 69 on the draft version 01.0, i.e. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Limit the requirement of fee payment for proposing a new methodology to submissions from stakeholders other than project participants, coordinating/managing entities, DOEs and DNAs; b) Allow a methodological panel or working group to initiate and proceed with the revision process without prior agreement by the Board; c) Keep the option of putting on-hold the existing version of methodology or methodological tool after 28 days in the revision process; d) Allow any stakeholders to make a clarification request; e) Ensure, when revising an approved methodology or methodological tool to incorporate clarifications, that the revision incorporates all relevant clarifications; f) Review the finalization step in the clarification process to possibly allow intervention by the Board on complex cases; g) Review the proposed three-track approach in the clarification process based on the expected proportion to be placed under each track. • Correction of errors in the draft version 01.0 • Editorial improvement
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

<i>Version</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
		<p>large scale afforestation and reforestation CDM project activities (version 01)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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

Keywords: applying methodologies and tools