

Name of submitter: Florian Reimer

Affiliated organization of the submitter (if any): Kennemer Eco Solution Pte Ltd

Contact email of submitter:

[REDACTED]

Date: 18/09/2023

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 (Completed by secretariat)
M	6.2		G	Make sure that terminology used can be interpreted and applied to be able to be fulfilled also by land use projects		
M	6.3		T	Option 2 should be chosen, but avoiding double issuance of credits for same ERRs under two different crediting schemes. (as also clarified in 8.3). E.g. by clarifying that issuance will be sought only after 1 of the 2 schemes, or there is a conversion from 1 scheme to permanently and fully to Article 6.4 and that vintages not yet credited will seek crediting under 6.4. [which is sort of addressed in 17(d)]	Option 2 should be chosen	
M	5.5	59	T	These short-timeframes might not work well for land use projects that require longer crediting periods to have the financial resources to ensure permanence required for minimum 30 or 40 years – including for emission reduction projects in agricultural land management (reduced burning, overgrazing) or REDD+.	Explore longer crediting periods (min 30 years) for land use projects.	

[illegible]