

Name of submitter:     Gilberto and Mailla    

Affiliated organization of the submitter (if any): [www.carbon-recycling.eco](http://www.carbon-recycling.eco)

Contact email of submitter: [admin@carbon-recycling.eco](mailto:admin@carbon-recycling.eco)

Date:   30/11/2023  

**Legend for Columns**

- 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

1	2	3	4	5	6
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>
1	1	G	<p>The comments below have three 'major issues' that will be brought to a separate document. One of them is that the Tool would contain the minimum expected coverage of the national systems, in order to allow for the SB to consider the national system is adequate and has been adequately used by the DNAs when issuing authorizations to the activities. The tool could also encourage DNAs to implement their national systems in decentralized and/or disaggregated manner to allow for regional and local public regulators/governances to provide authorizations on the local/regional aspects of the activity.</p> <p>However, certain methodologies are strongly related to certain aspects and impacts on both agendas (e.g. CO2 removals by A/R, SFM, biochar/bccs, beccs, redd+, etc) and emissions reductions (biofuels, renewable electricity, nuclear power, etc.). The A6.4 methodologies could highlight in their sections the required level of application of the SD tool requirements by the DNA prior to the authorization. The tool and the methodologies could describe the expected evidences to be presented by the host countries DNAs at the authorization, and the expected means to be used by the V&amp;V DOEs to confirm this evaluation and authorization were adequately performed. We need to recognize there will be a certain level of stress between the DNAs and SB in the consensual recognition of the proper application of the tool, but it is better to have this contentious settled down by the interaction between the DNAs and SB, as to leave them to a</p>		

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)
			<p>dubious resolution process between the activities participants and the DOEs, see our further comments below.</p> <p>if the SB does not accept our proposal that the host country has the regulatory force to ascertain the conformity of the A6.4 activity (and other activities) in regard to their targets on SD and EIA, the SB could at least require that the validation and verification submitted by the DOE, before is evaluated by the SB, is submitted to a previous approval by the host DNA, that shall confirm the activity design and was adequately reported by the proponents and the DOE has adequately proceeded with the validation and verification of this tool.</p>		
1	2	G	<p>The activities are primarily focused on monitoring their own impacts in the ERs (reductions and removals). The activity shall provide the information to the centralized entity monitoring of SD and EIA.</p> <p>The SD tool is used in a project by project case.... but nothing precludes that the SD is also used in a meth by meth case, requiring that the tool is applicable in a generic situation (irrespective of site location) for the meth, and at a specific case (in an activity proposed for an specific site).</p>		
2.1	5	G	<p>just "share during the local stakeholder consultation" is not sufficient... the procedure and the standard shall have provisions on "how to share" and how to collect feedbacks, and how to report and consider the feedback....</p>		

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)
2.2	6	G	<p>The definition of "local stakeholder" is also missing... locals residents, land tenants, non-governmental organizations may be somehow rewarded by the activity to make positive statements.... however, there might be unheard locals that remain outside of the discussion.... therefore the definition should be based on the identification of (i) influence area, that encompasses all neighbourhood directly or indirectly affected by the activity and (ii) the interested or potentially affected population, natural resources (bio, geo) and socio cultural material and immaterial assets and goods/landscapes/etc.</p>		
2.2	6(d)	G	<p>It is maybe too far to require the activity proponents to establish "monitoring indicators". This should be at the side of the host country national or subnational authorities. The activity proponents should be able to follow or monitor the indicators set by the local governments. It can also be set by the A6.4 Standard and Procedure that the local authorities are in charge of establishing the indicators. The activity proponents are not able to oversee all aspects of the sustainable development goals locally. If they are left to develop these indicators, the resulting collection of indicators will be confusing and obscure, because there is no public authority involved, and each project activity in the locality would use different indicators. This is not correct.</p>		
4	9(b)	G	<p>We repeat our previous comment, that the SD indicators should not be set and monitored at the activity level, but at the governance level (local, provincial, region, national). The activities should have the aim to make contributions to improve the indicators at the target area (influence area), since more than one activity may be implemented at the same area, and if they use different indicators, the comparison will not be possible. Further, the self monitoring (not by an independent or governmental institution) is not a good practice to demonstrate the effects of A6.4.</p>		

1	2	3	4	5	6
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)
4	9(c)	G	The examples of indicators of A/R are not necessarily indicators to be considered as part of a tool for SD evaluation of an activity, rather indicators of potential source of leakage, and could also or preferably be included at the methodology level. "Compensate tenants" sounds strange, because they should rather be part of the activity and be beneficiary from it, unless the activity is based on tenants and populations displacements (like the hydro dams or wind/solar), instead of compensating them for opportunity costs and allowing them to remain on land. Anyway, this is rather a methodological issue, not a SD side aspect.		
4	9(d)	G	The governmental public indicators (national and/or subnational levels) are the parameters to be monitored, not by the activity participants, preferably public or publicly recognized independent third party, to determine the time series of the indicators affected by the whole set of ongoing activities in the territory (not only 6.4). Why not to require the host countries to set up national (and encouraging to set up subnational) indicators and employ independent third party monitoring of those indicators? Observe that the ex-ante evaluation of an activity design (ADD) will only contain the expected impact from the single activity, and the monitoring will be done ex-post. If every and each activity is doing the monitoring of their own set of indicators, the information on the real situation of their joint impact on the SD will not be reported. The best way to go is to make the centralized public monitoring to cover the joint impact of the activities, and in case the indicators are not proceeding towards the public objectives, the reasons for the gap and the individual effects of the activities should be evaluated...		

1	2	3	4	5	6
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)
4	9 (e)	G	Unintended impacts may be foreseeable or unforeseeable... the ex-ante analysis and the management plan should be based on the foreseeable unintended adverse impacts... unforeseeable impacts should be detected and reported ex-post. If there are findings, the root cause analysis may identify gaps to the project activity, and eventually also to the methodology, if it is a systemic effect, turning it into a foreseeable impact, or if it is only locally occurring and not requiring systemic changes.		
4	9 (e) footnote 3	G	This is a dictionary way to define the "unintended". Better would be to define them as foreseeable negative impacts caused by or attributable to the activity, or being influenced in its frequency and intensity levels by the activity, but which occurrence is not under direct control of the activity participant, circumstances beyond the control of the activity participants being able to trigger or contribute to its occurrence, e.g. weather events, third party unauthorized actions, changed economic drivers, etc;		
4	9(f)	G	If the "direct" impact is defined, why not to define the "indirect"? If the "unintended" impacts are defined, why not to define the "intended" impacts? The direct intended and unintended impacts are more easy to forecast, they are the "foreseeable" impacts. The indirect unintended impacts are the usually "unforeseeable".		
5	10	G	Most often, the social impacts are part of the environmental impacts, because the environment has its dimensions of biophysical and socioeconomic aspects and attributes. This could be in the definition, or in a footnote to be according to the legal definitions at the host countries.		

1	2	3	4	5	6
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)
5	13(b)	G	<p>This is assuming that all host parties do have adequate legal/regulatory requirements. Maybe the SB should set minimum guidance/standard on the required regulations at the host countries. If the regulations are not meeting the guidance, financial means by the A6.4 public income can be used to finance the local authority. This would replace the last part of the paragraph, because the local authorities should be able to regulate not only the A6.4 activities, but all activities in the same minimum level, including the activities that do not mitigate emissions. Please refer to our separate letter.</p>		
5	13(b)(i)	G	<p>For the ex-ante forecast, the comparison is valid, but uncertain, because there are not precise methods to determine the influence of the single activity on the indicators, separately from the influence of other activities that might occur during the crediting period. For removals activities, up to 45 years crediting periods are eligible, and the estimation of the SD and EIA over such a long time are not safe and reliable. Most important is to set the expected targets (objectives) the authorities have sought for the progress of such indicators for the relevant period, and estimate the contribution the activity may have in the NEGATIVE impacts. For the positive impacts, the estimation should be less elaborated, only orders of magnitudes are to be estimated, and the monitoring will be in charge to determine the outcomes.</p>		
5	13(b)(iii)	G	<p>Shouldn't the activity participants also justify the exclusion of principles that have been considered by them as irrelevant (not applicable to their activity)?</p>		

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)
5	Table 1	G	<p>Nothing against the A6.4 activities to demonstrate their potential impacts and risks to SD, however:</p> <p>a) Why only A6.4 activities are required to make this analysis, and not the other NDC domestic, international (A6.2) or non-NDC activities (emissions increasing activities)?</p> <p>b) If the DNAs need resources for the implementation of governance, targets and monitoring of key indicators, why not to use the income generation potential of A6.4 authorizations to raise the resources for that system development?</p> <p>c) Why don't the A6.4 SB introduce a minimum required system for the DNAs to develop and use indicators to monitor the SD and EQ changes during the transition towards the neutrality (from 2025 to 2050) in order to follow the impacts of the entire set of projects changing the National Inventories? The national authorities should have a nationwide system for tracking the indicators, and should also be encouraged by SB to disaggregate this system into lower levels (province, local). Please refer to our separate letter.</p>		
5	13(c)(i)	G	<p>The monitoring of parameters, and mitigation actions, are sought only for the case of potential NEGATIVE impacts. However, many A6.4 activities will or may have strong potential to result in POSITIVE impacts in SD and EIA. Of course, the costs for the monitoring of positive impacts could be at the activity proponent, but this will be an unfair burden and an increase of the transactions costs. The national authority should raise funds from all A6.4 and A6.2 (and, why not, from non-climate mitigating economic activities) for monitoring the EIA and SD indicators (positive and negative).</p>		

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)
5	13(e)	G	<p>DOEs should have thus (i) the technical and professional capacity to make this validation and verification, which is not at the technical areas of the activity, but in a different knowledge and ability (the SDG and EIA); (ii) the fees for covering the validation and verification of these other non-climate-mitigation aspects of the audit work.</p> <p>It is an illusion to believe that the DOEs are able to validate and verify anything that is not described within a standard, following a procedure to collect and confirm the evidences the standard has been met. The DOEs are already overburden with the mission to audit A6.4ERs, under the pressure of two sides of the negotiation, which share the same interest of biasing the outcome by facilitating the validation and overestimating the results.</p> <p>The only way to include the V&amp;V into the SDG evaluation is:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) defining the national (and also subnational, preferably) objectives and the indicators and the standard to measure and report the results of any proposed public or private project (irrespective whether A6.4 or not) on these indicators.</li> <li>2) Have a system in place to measure and report the indicators of the progress in the SDG at the national/subnational levels, such as to allow for the monitor the joint effects of all projects and drivers affecting the outcome of the indicators;</li> <li>3) Require the A6.4 activity participants to monitor the specific operational (aspects, drivers) parameters of its implementation and the externalities (attributes, impacts) related to the activity at its influence area (in terms of contributions to SDG).</li> </ol> <p>Similarly, for Environmental Quality (air, water, soil, socioeconomic), the requirements for the V&amp;V are the same as above (1), (2), (3), mutatis mutandis.</p>		



1	2	3	4	5	6
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)
5.2.1	16P1.1	G	<p>Major issue: the risk assess to the climate vulnerability and adaptation effects (e.g. exposition and resilience increase or decrease to extreme weather impacts) should be part of the analysis. E.g. existing and created infrastructure may contribute to increased or decreased adaptation needs or requirements, and resilience of the local communities and ecosystems to the expected local impacts of climate change. Interaction mitigation/adaptation is highly recommended as an evaluation criteria of any A6.2 and A6.4 approach.</p> <p>Please refer to our separate letter.</p>		
5.2.1	Table 3 (and others)	G	<p>Why not to have the set of possible responses into the two columns? For example, the Yes/Potentially/No can be responded separately for the host country regulations, and for the generic risk assessment.</p> <p>The difference on how the two responses are given are unclear: (Q1) host country regulations and (Q2) generic risk assessment.</p> <p>If our proposal of the tool regulating the host country evaluation, the two questions would be: (Q1) if the host country regulations are adequate to cover this requirement and (Q2) If the host country regulations have been properly applied to the concrete case</p>		
5.2.1	Table 3 (and others)	G	<p>It is unclear how the general question about the conclusion of the assessment is to be answered, if there are several answers to the sub-principles. How to proceed if the answer is “yes” to one question, and “no” to other question? The conclusion for the general assessment is unclear.</p>		

Call for public input – Template for input [Draft: Article 6.4 sustainable development tool \(ver. 02.0\)](#)

1	2	3	4	5	6
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)
5.2.2	18	G	We consider effects regarding increased resources consumption and increased wastes disposal (and the associated emissions) as part of the methodology (for their “material boundary” see our previous inputs). Similarly, temporal effects beyond the crediting periods (e.g. the reversal emissions of CO2 removed by forests management, or the anaerobic disposal of wastes releasing methane, and/or temporary or long-term storage of radioactive wastes), in our opinion, are part of the project boundaries. The questions about the side effects on the air, water, soil, etc. are considered only for the non-climate related pollutants or environmental impacts.		
5.2.2	19 (and others)	G	There is a potential POSITIVE side effects for some A6.4 activities, that may result in reduced impacts on the air, soil, and water, as compared with the baseline technology or scenario. These effects, although not eligible for climate mitigation, may have separated crediting systems in the country to make the voluntary "payment for environmental services" for their enhanced "ecosystems services", related for example, with the water availability, biodiversity, and resilience/adaptation to climate change. Also air pollutant emissions and water pollutant discharges regulated by other crediting systems may be in place or may be introduced at the host countries, for the monitoring of project activities outcomes and asserting their positive impacts. This could be mentioned in the principle, encouraging the indicators monitoring not only for the negative aspects, but also the positive ones.		

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)
5.2.2	20	G	<p>Unclear to us, what is here the “historical pollution” existence of air contamination. Is this part of the preexisting conditions at the local site, or at the baseline (future hypothetical situation under the absence of the project activity)? Is this bound to a concept of saturation of the atmosphere/streams to the reception of pollutants?.</p> <p>The national laws are never completely "silent" (courts decisions usually covers the unwritten gaps by means of normative jurisprudence). Better to refer to the local law being "unable to determine the activity liability" to mitigate the preexisting sources.</p>		
5.2.2	21 (and followers)	G	<p>"Soil and subsoil" would be a better name for the principle, other than "land". Land is the useful space above surface, where natural ecosystems or human use or occupation may occur, while soil and subsoil are the surface and the subsurface and below ground spaces, and may include and cover the the groundwater quality and availability aspects.</p>		
5.2.2	23	G	<p>"Erosion" affects not only the surface and groundwater, but the land (surface exposed soil) and its potential use for many applications (agriculture, forestry, etc.). Therefore, the most adequate text would be "... measures will be undertaken to ensure that the soil and land use, as well as the surface and groundwaters are protected from erosion and that these measures are in place prior to the commencement of the activity". The para 24 is somehow overlapping with 23 and may be joint together, or kept separated, but the effects of erosion (physical loss of surface soil by water or wind shear) should be covered in just one paragraph, in our opinion.</p>		
5.2.2	25	G	<p>Ffunctions and services provided by the land uses and landscape conservation. Observe that in the case of wind energy and solar panels, the landscape and land-use are critical aspects to be evaluated.</p>		

1	2	3	4	5	6
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)
5.2.2	Table 5	G	The table 5 is indeed necessary. But activities which involve the use of increased amounts of non-renewable minerals, like e-cars, biofuels, synfuels, nuclear power, etc., should also have to evaluate their impacts on GHG emissions by the increased use of resources and generation of wastes, see our insisted points on material and temporal boundaries, in the previous inputs related to the requirements for methodologies.		
5.2.2	“	G	The table has a fore last line with the question “Does the activity have a risk of releasing pollutants to air, water, and land in routine, non-routine or accidental circumstances?” Why to include air and land (soil) here? this table is only about water.		
5.2.3	33	G	not very clear, what does a precautionary approach means, and what a non-precautionary approach would be.		
5.3.2	45	G	Para 45 is identical to Para 44		
5.3.2	Table 9	G	Second line of the table has a question “Does the project design document describe how the proposed activity promotes social labour and working conditions as described in paras 53 and 54 ?” These two paragraph numbers are incorrect, please check.		
5.3.3	Table 10	G	The table is questioning if the activity involves “Air pollution, noise, vibration, traffic, injuries, physical hazards, poor surface water quality due to runoff, erosion, sanitation?” In our opinion, any building construction, or even its use, may have this potential impact... any building used for office or home, as well. There are limits to be considered as DESERVING RELEVANCE.		
5.3.6	62	G	Paragraph refers to “the forcible removal of Indigenous Peoples from their lands and territories”. We would say "forcible or non-forcible", because if the indigenous people are removed, even when under accepted conditions, they loose the condition of being "indigenous" people. The resettlement is usually an incompatible condition to the classification as 'indigenous people'.		

1	2	3	4	5	6
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)
5.3.6	Table 13	G	The table has a question “Does the activity <u>lack</u> appropriate feedback and grievance channels for Indigenous Peoples and their representatives? (see para 66.)” This question induces incorrect interpretation by the users: questions should be formulated in a manner to keep the responses at the same side of positive/negative aspects for the yes/no answer. Instead of asking whether the activity lack appropriateness, the question should be whether the activity <u>has</u> appropriate feedback and grievance channels.		
5.3.8	72	G	The paragraph makes reference to “assessment by competent professionals, recognized by the host government”. Public recognition is usually bound to the professional ability based on education degree, all professionals with the same degree are thus deemed as 'competent'.		
6.3.1	80 (a)	G	The para describes “Step 1: Activity participants are required to elaborate relevant activity-level indicators for the SDGs identified as impacted, taking into consideration the SDG, SDG targets and SDG indicators. <u>At least one SDG target</u> and corresponding indicator(s) for each SDG should be chosen (see Table 16 below);” Why not to require “all relevant targets”, instead of “at least one”?		
6.3.1	Table 16	G	The Table defines as SDG indicator for renewable energy generation “the amount of GHG emissions avoided or sequestered per year in tCO <sub>2</sub> e”. In fact, this is not a good indicator because it is the solely purpose of the activity, and is directly monitored by it as the A6.4ERs. Better, would be the indicator related, for example, in the share of renewable energy generation capacity or effectively generated renewable electricity within the host country.		
6.3.1	80(b)(ii) and (iii)	G	The para is referring to the indicator as “Be primarily/directly impacted by the activity (not be one-off);”. The meaning of “not be one-off” is unclear. It seems to be a “just once” criterion. An example could help. Item (iii) refers to a form, that is not available.		

1	2	3	4	5	6
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)
6.3.1	81	G	The para is requiring “outcome (including the form) must be shared during the local stakeholder consultation and with the DOE performing validation.” This procedure description is vague... what are the concrete means (media) to be used for this “share”? The local consultation process, hopefully, addresses this requirement in a more precise manner.		
7	86	G	The para is requiring “The DOE shall provide confirmation that based on the A6.4 Environmental and Social Management Plan and the A6.4 Sustainable Development form, the proposed activity results in no harm and contributes to sustainable development”. Please consider our previous remarks about the role of DOEs and DNAs/host country evaluation, and our separate letter. “Zero harm” is almost impossible to any human activity.		
8	88	G	Similarly to the previous, the para is requiring “The DOE shall review any inputs comments received via continuous engagement of local stakeholders in accordance with the “Article 6.4 activity standard for projects” or the “Article 6.4 activity standard for programmes of activities” and conduct an interview with local stakeholders and employ professional judgement in the evaluation of the ex-post fulfilment of do-no-harm and sustainable development impacts due to the activity considering host country regulatory requirements applicable to the proposed activity”.  It's not a fair attribution of responsibility to the DOEs, without providing them with the instructions on how to issue a “do-no-harm” conclusion. DOEs are liable for their conclusions, and these should be based on precise instructions on what is “zero harm”.		
8	90	G	The para is referring to an “example received by a DOE”, which is not found.		