

I understand that the SB is considering choosing between option 1 and option 2. I would like to offer my strong support for option 2, for the following reasons:

1. Option 2 would allow existing voluntary projects that meet the rigorous standards for 6.4 activities to be "transited" to A6.4. This would incentivize project developers and participants to invest sooner in GHG reduction projects recognized under A6.4, possibly even before A6.4 is fully operationalized. As we cannot afford to wait to take action on climate change, this would help to achieve the objectives of the Paris Agreement.

2. As long as double issuance is prevented, there is no reason why double registration should be restricted. Doing so would not compromise the integrity of the credits generated nor the intended GHG reductions.

If SB must choose option 1, I would suggest making an exception for deregistered projects. This means once ongoing projects (that are not expired/excluded) from other crediting schemes are deregistered, these projects should be allowed to be registered under A6.4 mechanism, upon meeting all the requirements under A6.4 mechanism.