



CALL FOR INPUT

Name of submitter	Florence Laloe
Affiliated organization of submitter (if any)	Conservation International
Email of submitter	flaloe@conservation.org
Date of submission	19 June 2025

Document reference number and title:

A6.4-MEP006-A02. Concept note: Applicability of removal guidance to emission reductions activities and vice versa (version 01.0)

Item	Section no. (as indicated in the document)	Paragraph/Table/Figure no. (as indicated in the document)	Comment (including justification for change)	Proposed change (including proposed text)
1	3.1.3	13	<p>The principle that a baseline should be "below business-as-usual" is broadly appropriate for emission reduction activities, where a lower baseline (fewer projected emissions) results in fewer credits issued and therefore represents a conservative approach.</p> <p>However, for AFOLU removal activities, this logic does not directly apply. In these cases, the baseline reflects the expected accumulation of carbon in the absence of the project, such as through natural regeneration. Here, setting a higher baseline—meaning assuming more carbon would have been sequestered without the project—results in fewer net removals being credited. In this context, a higher baseline is actually the more conservative choice.</p>	It would be helpful for future revisions of the baseline standard to explicitly recognize this distinction and avoid applying a uniform definition of conservativeness (as a lower baseline).
2	3.1.4	14	The broad term, "equitable" can be interpreted in many ways depending on political, economic, or cultural perspectives.	Suggest that the text clarify what is meant by "equitable" in this context.

Document reference number and title:**A6.4-MEP006-A02. Concept note: Applicability of removal guidance to emission reductions activities and vice versa (version 01.0)**

Item	Section no. (as indicated in the document)	Paragraph/Table/Figure no. (as indicated in the document)	Comment (including justification for change)	Proposed change (including proposed text)
3	3.2.10	37	Avoidance of other negative environmental and social impacts and respecting human rights and the rights of Indigenous Peoples.	Suggest that the MEP consider going further. Rather than focusing solely on minimizing harm, the guidance could explicitly encourage the prioritization of project types that generate positive social and environmental co-benefits.