

Name of submitter: David Knecht

Affiliated organization of the submitter (if any): Swiss Lenten Fund

Contact email of submitter: [REDACTED]

Date: 20.09.2023

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	6.7.	62-63	G	We appreciate that the referencing of the Environmental & social impacts, sustainable development benefits assessment.		
M	6.9.	65	G	We appreciate the reflections on how to handle gaps between the modalities in Appendix 2 on Local Stakeholder Consultations (LSC) and host Party rules. We understand these modalities in Appendix 2 as minimum requirements for LSC. In this sense we clearly favour option 1. Especially, because letter (b) of Par 65 takes effectively care of possible incompatibilities between host Party rules and the modalities in Appendix 2 in case they arise.	We favour Option 1 on LSC.	
M	6.10	69-70	G	We appreciate that the Global Stakeholder Consultation is referenced in the AS-P.		
M	6.12		G	<p>We suggest adding a section 6.12 on “local continuous stakeholder engagement mechanism”.</p> <p>In line with the continuous engagement mechanism of the Activity Cycle Procedures (ACP-P), which offers a communication channel between the activity proponent and national/international stakeholders, which are aware of the UNFCCC portal and its functionalities, there is a need for a continuous engagement mechanism between the activity proponent and local stakeholders. This communication channel must be adapted to local circumstances, e.g. a phone-number, a whatsapp-number, a mobile-app or an official logbook for comments. This allows stakeholders to contact the project proponent in their local language avoiding language barriers and the barrier to access international webportals.</p> <p>During verification, DOEs can ask activity proponents to share a summary of comments received.</p> <p>Advantage: This gives local stakeholder an easy-to-access channel to get into contact with project proponents and share comments/ideas/concerns on a more direct and informal level.</p>	<p>Proposed text:</p> <p>1. The activity participant shall set up a continuous engagement mechanism for local stakeholders that allows stakeholders to contact the activity participant in their local language.</p> <p>2. This mechanism shall be aligned with national and local circumstances.</p> <p>3. The activity participant shall share a summary of comments received with the DOE at each verification.</p> <p>[according provisions would need to be added in the verification procedures VVS-P.]</p>	
A.2	1-4	1-15	G	The modalities for LSC are clearly formulated.		

[illegible]