



## CALL FOR INPUT

Name of submitter	Axel Michaelowa
Affiliated organization of submitter (if any)	Perspectives Climate Research
Email of submitter	michaelowa@perspectives.cc
Date of submission	28/09/2025

Instruction: Enter your input in the table below.

<b>Document reference number and title:</b> <b>A6.4-MEP008-A01. Draft methodological tool: Investment analysis (version 01.0)</b>				
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	7a	Minimum requirements for the procedure should be defined to prevent that the procedure enables “gaming” of scenarios towards making a non additional activity additional by comparing it against an unrealistic scenario.	Add sentence: “This procedure shall ensure that the alternative scenarios retained are conservative, i.e. make it less likely that the activity is deemed additional.”
2	6.3	28g	Need to define what is “reasonable” in quantitative terms	Add appendix defining “reasonable” percentage variations for different parameters and reference it in para 28g
3	6.3	28h	Option 2 should be retained. There is no objective reason to require that the revenues from A6.4ERs are larger than the funding gap. Activity developers may want to implement the activity and willing to take a loss, e.g. if they want to enter a new market.	Delete para 28h
4	6.3	28i	The issue addressed by para 28i is relevant as long as any public funding is involved. There is no reason to limit it to cases where public funding is larger than the expected revenues from sale of A6.4ERs	Delete “If the .... Article 6.4 activity)”
5	6.4	31g	Need to define what is “reasonable” in quantitative terms	Add appendix defining “reasonable” percentage variations for different parameters and reference it in para 31g

**Document reference number and title:****A6.4-MEP008-A01. Draft methodological tool: Investment analysis (version 01.0)**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Section no.</b> (as indicated in the document)	<b>Paragraph/Table/Figure no.</b> (as indicated in the document)	<b>Comment</b> (including justification for change)	<b>Proposed change</b> (including proposed text)
6	6.4	31h	Option 2 should be retained. There is no objective reason to require that the revenues from A6.4ERs are larger than the funding gap. Activity developers may want to implement the activity and willing to take a loss, e.g. if they want to enter a new market.	Delete para 31h
7	6.4	31i	The issue addressed by para 31i is relevant as long as any public funding is involved. There is no reason to limit it to cases where public funding is larger than the expected revenues from sale of A6.4ERs	Delete “If the .... Article 6.4 activity)”
8	7.1	35	A universal maximum end point is less appropriate than a end date derived by the share of net discounted revenues accruing after that date becoming smaller than a materiality threshold of the net present value of total cumulated revenues.	Replace current para 35 text by “The end date shall be set at the point in time from which the net present value of cumulative net revenues in future years becomes less than 5% of the net present value of total cumulative net revenues of the activity.”
9	7.6.3	53	Choose the lower, i.e. more conservative value resulting from the two approaches.	Replace “may” by “shall apply the lower of”
10	7.8	66	Provide mandatory minimum sensitivity analysis of 10% to prevent inconsistency across methodologies.	Replace “It is recommended . type of mitigation activity” by “Mechanism methodologies shall require a variation of at least +/- 10% to the input values which constitute more than 20% of the total costs or total revenues. If a methodology applies a lesser value, it needs to show unequivocally that the lower value does not lead to a higher probability of non-additional projects passing the investment test.”

-- (Please add rows as required) -ue of the net revenues acc