

## Questions for Public Inputs

### General Questions

1. In relation to the inputs<sup>1</sup> prepared for the consideration of the Supervisory Body on requirements for the development and assessment of methodologies for the mechanism established by Article 6, paragraph 4, of the Paris Agreement, what is missing and what can be improved?

### Baseline Setting

#### *General*

2. What is understood by **the elements in the chapeau to paragraph 33 of the RMP and how could they be operationalized?**
  - a) *encourage ambition over time;*
  - b) *encourage broad participation;*
  - c) *be real, transparent, conservative, credible, below 'business as usual';*
  - d) *avoid leakage, where applicable;*
  - e) *recognize suppressed demand;*
  - f) *align with the long-term temperature goal of the Paris Agreement;*
  - g) *contribute to the equitable sharing of mitigation benefits between the participating Parties;*
  - h) *In respect of each participating Party, contribute to reducing emission levels in the host Party, and align with its NDC, if applicable, its long-term low GHG emission development strategy if it has submitted one and the long-term goals of the Paris Agreement.*
3. **How might these elements be further elaborated with reference to literature?**

#### *Specific*

4. What is understood by **the performance-based approach(es) identified in paragraph 36 of the RMP?**
  - a) Best Available Technologies (BAT) that represent an economically feasible and environmentally sound course of action, where appropriate;
  - b) An ambitious benchmark approach where the baseline is set at least at the average emission level of the best performing comparable activities providing similar outputs and services in a defined scope in similar social, economic, environmental and technological circumstances;
  - c) An approach based on existing actual or historical emissions, adjusted downwards to ensure alignment with paragraph 33 of the RMP.
5. Where might each of these approaches be most applicable – with reference to different programmes or experiences?
6. How might each of these approaches be implemented – with reference to different programmes or experience?

---

<sup>1</sup> A6.4-SB004-AA-A10 - Draft recommendation: Requirements for the development and assessment of mechanism methodologies and the documents referred under its document history comprise the previous inputs in this area.

7. **The interaction of the elements from paragraph 33 and approaches identified in paragraph 36 of the RMP:**
  - a) How do the options for implementation of paragraph 33 of the RMP identified in the paper deliver on the proposed elements?
    - i. Scalability and replicability
    - ii. Increasing stringency over time
  - b) How could implementation of the approaches identified in paragraph 36 of the RMP address the elements?
8. Should the stringency over time be in the form of a net-to-gross adjustment to the emission reductions achieved applied in all methodologies, or should stringency be sought through a sector-specific or region-specific adjustment factor, or both?
9. If adoption of a sector-specific and region-specific adjustment factor is proposed, should it be based on projections of sectoral and regional decarbonization pathways provided in the Sixth Assessment Report of Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) or relevant International Energy Agency (IEA) publications?
10. Should there be a process to receive such factor(s) recommended by a Host Party for consideration by the Supervisory Body?

### **Additionality**

#### *General*

11. **The interaction of the elements from paragraph 33 and approaches identified in paragraph 36 with paragraph 38 of the RMP on Additionality:**
  - a) How should the different elements of the additionality requirements be understood?
  - b) How should the different elements be demonstrated?
    - i. 'would not have occurred in the absence of the incentives from the mechanism';
    - ii. 'taking into account all relevant national policies, including legislation';
    - iii. 'representing mitigation that exceeds any mitigation that is required by law or regulation;
    - iv. 'taking a conservative approach that avoids locking in levels of emissions, technologies or carbon intensive practices incompatible with paragraph 33 of the RMP'
12. In relation to the proposals identified in the inputs to operationalize the requirements of paragraph 38 of the RMP, what is missing and what can be improved?

#### *Specific*

13. Are there classes of project, or levels and lifetimes of emissions that would deliver lock in? how might these be identified?
14. Are there classes of project, or levels and lifetimes of emissions that might be favored in a positive list?
15. What elements or criteria should be used to determine eligibility for automatic additionality, i.e., inclusion on a "positive list"?
16. How to consider regulations enforced during the crediting period (CP) under the regulatory surplus test (e.g. At the time of enforcement or at renewal of the CP)?
17. What elements should be retested during renewal of crediting period?
18. Should the crediting period less than 5 years be eligible to be specified in methodologies?

19. Should enforcement rates of mandatory regulations be considered in the additionality demonstration?

### **General Questions on baseline and additionality**

20. How might the application of the elements and approaches for baseline and additionality identified vary according to countries, sectors, technologies or practices or implementation scale?
21. How might the application of the elements and approaches for baseline and additionality identified vary in respect of activities that occur within the boundaries of a large-scale (e.g., national, sub-national, sectoral) strategy or program for reducing and removing GHG emissions?
22. How might these elements or options to address them be informed by assessments such as in IPCC and IEA or Food and Agriculture Organization?
23. How might these elements be informed by host countries standards or policies?

### **Leakage**

#### *General*

24. What is meant by leakage?
25. When does leakage occur, where are the greatest risks?

#### *Specific*

26. What are the main approaches to address leakage at different scales?
27. What are the classes of activities for which monitoring at jurisdictional level may be necessary to quantify and account for leakage?
28. Should the emissions from the construction phase be accounted for as leakage or project emissions?
29. In which cases and by what methods should 'activity carbon leakages' be addressed?

### **Non-permanence and reversals**

30. Where are non-permanence risks in respect of emission reductions?
31. How are these typically addressed, what are the options?

### **Standardized baselines**

32. Should a standardized baseline for a group of host Parties be eligible?

### **Policies, measures and circumstances:**

33. In relation to paragraph 34 of the RMP, what guidance should be developed to take into account policies, measures and relevant circumstances, including national, regional or local, social, economic, environmental and technological circumstances?