



NEW BASELINE AND MONITORING METHODOLOGY OR METHODOLOGICAL TOOL INITIAL ASSESSMENT FORM (Version 02.0)

INFORMATION TO BE COMPLETED BY THE SECRETARIAT

Type of standard	Choose an item.	
Title of the proposed new baseline and monitoring methodology or new methodological tool	>>	
Date of completion of the initial assessment	Click or tap to enter a date.	
Note for completing below:		
<p>Please assess the quality of the submitted new methodology according to the “Procedure: Development, revision and clarification of methodologies and methodological tools” (A6.4-PROC-METH-001).</p> <p>The responses to the evaluation criteria below shall be considered as evidence for the evaluation of a case as <u>qualified</u> or <u>unqualified</u>. Each of the ten questions below carries a score of either 0 or 1. Where a score of 1 indicates that the submission is in compliance with all the requirements related to the applicable evaluation criteria in each question, and a score of 0 indicates non-compliance.</p> <p>The proposed new methodology will be graded as “unqualified” for the consideration of the Methodologies Expert Panel if it receives a score of 0 for any of the evaluation criteria. For questions that receive a score of 0, the rationale will be included in order to provide relevant feedback to the proponent of the proposed new methodology.</p> <p>If the proposed new methodology receives a score greater than zero for all evaluation criteria, it will be graded as “qualified”, assigned a unique reference number, and further processed according to the procedures.</p>		
<u>No</u>	<u>Evaluation criteria</u>¹	<u>Score (0 or 1)</u>
1	<p>Completeness, clarity and adequacy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does the proposed new methodology or methodological tool cover all sections as outlined in the applicable guidelines? - Is the language in the proposed new methodology or methodological tool sufficiently transparent, precise and unambiguous to undertake a full assessment? - Does the proposed new methodology or methodological tool reflect methodology/tool-specific information and not project/programme-specific information? - Are key terms defined (for those not already defined in the Article 6.4 mechanism regulatory framework)? 	>>
	<p>Rationale if the score is “0”</p> <p>>></p>	
2	Applicability conditions and definitions:	>>

¹ Evaluation criteria should be considered in the light of the standards ‘Application of the requirements of Chapter V.B (Methodologies) for the development and assessment of Article 6.4 mechanism methodologies’ (A6.4-STAN-METH-001) and if applicable ‘Requirements for activities involving removals under the Article 6.4 mechanism’ (A6.4-STAN-METH-002) as well as any other related standards adopted by the Article 6.4 Supervisory Body.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Are the applicability conditions clear and not contradictory? - Do they include clarity on whether these need to be assessed at the start of the activity, at the start of each crediting period or for each monitoring period? - Are the definitions clear, complete, and aligned with the Article 6.4 framework? - Are all necessary applicability conditions in place to prevent environmental integrity risks and limit the use of the methodology or tool to the intended purpose? - Is the compliance with the applicability conditions of the proposed new methodology or methodological tool possible to demonstrate and validate? 	
<p>Rationale if the score is “0”</p> <p>>></p>		
3	<p>Sources of emission and carbon pools, activity boundary and leakages:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does the proposed new methodology or methodological tool cover all the GHG emission sources, sinks and reservoirs and the types of GHG that are controlled, related to or otherwise affected by the activities covered by the methodology or methodological tool? - Is the activity boundary clearly defined in the proposed new methodology? (<i>applicable to proposed new methodologies only</i>) - Does the proposed new methodology or methodological tool appropriately identify and address all potential sources of leakages as per the standard “addressing leakage in mechanism methodologies”? - Does the proposed methodology ensure that the project or PoA and corresponding CPs delivers services comparable to the baseline (or alternatively addresses appropriately the discrepancy between both in the case of land-use change projects)? 	>>
<p>Rationale if the score is “0”</p> <p>>></p>		
4	<p>Baseline identification and quantification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does the proposed new methodology adequately select and justify one or more approaches for setting the baseline (BAT, ambitious benchmark, historical emission adjusted downwards)? - Is the selected approach for setting the baseline correctly applied (e.g. procedure for setting the BAT, ambitious benchmark of historical emissions adjusted downwards)? - Are the approaches for applying downward adjustment (in the calendar year of the start date of the first crediting period and/or in subsequent years) adequate? - For alternative approaches for downward adjustment or for exemption from downward adjustment, is an appropriate justification provided? - Does the methodology adequately determine and quantify (and if applicable, justify) the conservative BAU scenario and emissions? - Does the methodology provide a clear approach for the comparison and selection of crediting baseline (including ex-ante and ex-post) in line with section 9 of the standard “setting the baseline in mechanism methodologies”? - Could the application of the methodology result in a baseline scenario that reasonably and/or conservatively represents the emissions by sources of 	>>

	<p>greenhouse gases that would occur in the absence of the proposed project activity? Is it clearly described in the relevant draft PDD or PoA DD?</p> <p>Are there any environmental integrity concerns which are not addressed by the proposed approach for baseline identification?</p>	
	<p>Rationale if the score is “0”</p> <p>>></p>	
5	<p>Additionality and environmental integrity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is the proposed approach for assessment and demonstration of additionality in the proposed new methodology clearly described? - Does the proposed assessment and demonstration of additionality align with the standard “Demonstration of additionality in mechanism methodologies” or provide sufficient justification for alternative approaches? - Are there any threats to the environmental integrity which are not addressed by the proposed approach? - Does the methodology ensure that quantified emissions reductions or removals are from the implementation of the activity and not from exogenous factors? - Does the methodology avoid the various potential forms of double counting? 	>>
	<p>Rationale if the score is “0”</p> <p>>></p>	
6	<p>Removals and risks of reversal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - For methodologies for activities delivering both emission reductions and removals, do equations adequately distinguish between both types of outcomes? (Emission reductions vs. removals)? - Does the methodology or tool adequately identify, quantify and address risks of reversals? - Does the methodology adequately set provisions for addressing the risk of reversal, including in the post-crediting monitoring period? 	>>
	<p>Rationale if the score is “0”</p> <p>>></p>	
7	<p>Calculation of emission reductions and/or removals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Do the sections on baseline emissions/baseline net GHG removals, project emissions/actual net GHG removals, leakage emissions and emission reductions/net GHG removal in the proposed new methodology or methodological tool contain relevant equations? - Do the equations adequately represent the underlying activity or technology? - Are all variables used in the equations adequately described? - Do the equations allow for accurate/conservative estimation of emission reduction/ net GHG removal? - Are the approaches to estimate emission reduction/ enhanced GHG removal by sinks clearly described in the proposed new methodology and the draft PDD or PoA-DD? - Are there any threats to the environmental integrity which are not addressed by the proposed approach? 	>>
	<p>Rationale if the score is “0”</p>	

	>>	
8	<p>Monitored and non-monitored parameters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - For each variable in the equations, is it clear whether it shall be (i) calculated, (ii) determined once and not monitored, or (iii) monitored? - Do the sections (i) data/parameters not to be monitored and (ii) data/parameters to be monitored cover all relevant variables used in the equations? Do the sections also cover how to account for uncertainty associated with parameters to be monitored and not to be monitored (e.g. default factors, activity data, etc)? - Do the monitoring tables provide clear approaches to determine the parameters and apply QA/QC procedures? - Is the vintage of data clearly defined? <p>Are uncertainties and accuracy of instrumentation taken into account, where relevant?</p> <p>Rationale if the score is “0”</p>	>>
	>>	
9	<p>Alignment with provisions of the methodology standard:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does the proposed new methodology demonstrate compliance with the requirements related to the following methodological principles as per the “Standard: Application of the requirements of Chapter V.B (Methodologies) for the development and assessment of Article 6.4 mechanism methodologies” below, and are these principles consistently applied in the proposed new methodology? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Encouraging ambition over time; (a) Contributing to the equitable sharing of mitigation benefits between participating Parties; (b) Aligning with the NDCs/LT-LEDs/long-term goals of the Paris Agreement, in line with Appendix 1 of the standard “Setting the baseline in mechanism methodologies” (c) Encouraging broad participation; <p>Rationale if the score is “0”</p>	>>
	>>	
	<p>Resubmission:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If it is a resubmitted proposed new methodology, are all the issues raised in the previous recommendations addressed? 	>>
10	<p>Rationale if the score is “0”</p> <p><i>(Note: a score of 1 should be automatically assigned for this criterium in case the submission is not found to be a resubmission)</i></p>	>>
	>>	
	TOTAL SCORE	
ADDITIONAL INFORMATION		
	<p>Is a similar methodology(ies) already under review/approved under the Article 6.4 mechanism? <i>(If YES, specify the reference number)</i></p>	>>
	<p>Is the methodology similar to a CDM methodology</p>	>>

<i>(If YES, specify the reference number of the methodology, whether approved, rejected or currently under consideration)</i>	
ADDITIONAL REMARKS	
>>	

- - - - -

Document information

<i>Version</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
02.0	13 August 2025	Revision to the structure and overall content of the evaluation criteria sections and minor editorial improvements.
01.0	18 December 2024	Initial publication of form template.

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