

Name of submitter: Hannah Morton , Victor Giraldo

Affiliated organization of the submitter (if any): \_\_\_\_\_

Contact email of submitter: [REDACTED]

Date: 28.09.2023

**Legend for Columns**

- 0 = Main document or Appendix (provide Appendix number)
- 1 = Section Number in the document or Appendix
- 2= Paragraph, table or figure number
- 3 = Nature of input is general, technical or editorial
- 4 = Comment – the actual feedback or observation, including justification for what needs changing
- 5 = Proposed change – suggest the text if possible
- 6 = Assessment of comment – secretariat to document response/action taken to comment

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
M or A#	Section no.	Para., table or figure no.	Type of input G = general T = technical E = editorial	Comment	Proposed change (Include proposed text)	Assessment of comment <i>(Completed by secretariat)</i>
M	6.1	11	G	The prior consideration notification shall clarify the level of project retroactivity from the project start date to submit the request to the secretariat	The activity participants shall, prior to proceeding with requesting registration through a DOE, demonstrate that the Article 6.4 mechanism benefits were considered necessary in the decision to undertake the project as an A6.4 project by submitting a “prior consideration notification” <b>between the first xx (months or years from the project start date)</b> to the secretariat, containing a summary of the project information in accordance with the “Article 6.4 mechanism activity cycle procedure for projects”	

Call for public input – Template for input [Draft Standard: Article 6.4 mechanism activity standard for projects \(ver. 03.0\)](#)

0 M or A#	1 Section no.	2 Para., table or figure no.	3 Type of input G = general T = technical E= editorial	4 Comment	5 Proposed change (Include proposed text)	6 Assessment of comment (Completed by secretariat)
M	6.2	12(f)	T	<p>Whilst it is understood that the mechanism methodologies are not yet published, the information listed in 12(f) is highly specific to technology-based project attributes and are not fit for purpose for nature-based projects.</p>	<p><b>Proposal to add to 12(i):</b></p> <p>The activity participants shall describe the proposed A6.4 project in the PDD to provide an understanding of the nature and the outline of the project by providing, inter alia, the following information: (a) The title and the UNFCCC reference number of the project consistent with those indicated in, and assigned to, the prior consideration notification referred to in paragraph 11 above; (b) The sectoral scopes linked to the methodologies applied and relevant to the project; (c) The purpose and a general description of the project; (d) The confirmation that the project is within the types of A6.4 activities indicated by the host Party that it would consider approving in accordance with paragraph 26(e) of the RMPs; (e) The geographical location of the project; 7 (f) The technologies/measures/activities to be employed and/or implemented by the project, including: (i) A list of the facilities, systems, practices, polygons; tree species and silvicultural targets (afforestation, reforestation or restoration) and/or equipment that will be planted, installed and/or modified, by the project;</p> <p>The types and levels of services or <b>ecosystem services</b> provided by the <b>plantations</b>, facilities, systems, practices and/or equipment and their relation, if any, to other facilities, <b>ecosystems</b>, systems and equipment outside the project boundary; (iii) The arrangement of the <b>polygons</b> facilities, systems, practices and/or equipment; (iv) The age and average lifetime of any equipment based on the manufacturer’s specifications and industry standards <b>and the expected nature based system target cycle (rotational or conservation)</b>; (v) The installed capacities, <b>planted areas</b> load factors and efficiencies; (vi) The energy and mass flows and balances of the facilities, systems and equipment, if necessary; (vii) The monitoring <b>equipment or protocol</b> and their location in the systems ; (g) The technologies/measures existing prior to the implementation of the project at the same site, as applicable, including the equivalent information listed in subparagraph (f) above on the facilities, <b>polygons</b>, systems and equipment; (h) A summary of the baseline scenario as established in accordance with section 6.5.3 below, including the equivalent information listed in subparagraph (f) above</p>	

Call for public input – Template for input			<a href="#">Draft Standard: Article 6.4 mechanism activity standard for projects (ver. 03.0)</a>			
0	1	2	3	4	5	6
M or A#	Section no.	Para., table or figure no.	Type of input G = general T = technical E = editorial	Comment	Proposed change (Include proposed text)	Assessment of comment (Completed by secretariat)
M	6.3	16	E	Given the development of a meta registry designed to manage the risk of double counting/issuance, there is no reason in which double registration of projects (when managed properly).	Option 2 maintained (Option 1 deleted)	
M	6.9	17	G	Option 1 is the most comprehensive and suitable. This is because it offers an alternative (b) if the project cannot meet the gap analysis requirements as outlined in Appendix 2 when compared to the country's regulations. If a significant conflict arises, b option allows for the description of the modalities chosen and justification for the choice.	Option 1 maintained (Option 2 deleted)	
M	7.3.5	83(a)	E	<p>We perceive Option 3 as being most suitable for inclusion for all project types.</p> <p>Whilst it is understood that for technology-based projects, capacity can only be scaled at small margins or increments. Nature-based projects are subject to different constraints, wherein scale is a function of land availability and the application of eligibility criteria. To maximise the sustainability benefit of projects, we suggest increasing the project's capacity by any degree, subject to the approval by the host Party</p>	Option 3 maintained (Option 1 & 2 deleted)	