

Forair Inc.
134-686, Grande-allée Est,
Québec, Québec
Canada, G1R 2K5



October 26th, 2023

Object: Open Letter to the Supervisory Body responsible for A6.4 mechanism

Dear CMA Supervisory Body,

I am writing this letter to share my experience as a stakeholder in the process of establishing the Article 6.4 mechanism of the Paris Agreement. I hope that, upon reading this letter, you will clearly understand that my company feels disheartened by the same committee that had previously promised to consider input from all stakeholders.

Forair is a private company specializing in the development of carbon offset forest projects in Canada. Our mission is to engage private landowners in managing their land to increase the capture of additional carbon dioxide equivalent (CO₂ eq.) beyond business-as-usual levels, using robust baseline scenario parameters, as is appropriate. To ensure the environmental integrity of the carbon credits generated by our projects, Forair strongly prefers the *ex-post tonne-year* quantification method. This preference is based on the method's scientific reliability, in contrast to the tonne-tonne quantification method. We recognize that the tonne-year method is more restrictive and results in fewer carbon credits during the early years of the project compared to the tonne-tonne method. However, given Forair's commitment to being a positive actor in the fight against climate change and prioritizing environmental concerns above all else, the choice to use this method was straightforward.

Moreover, we firmly believe that it is the responsibility of stakeholders involved in the mechanism you are creating to educate the public on ways to reduce emissions and remove them from the atmosphere. This is why the SB's decision not to include the *ex-post tonne-year* quantification method in the Article 6 mechanism left us perplexed. On July 21, 2023, Forair submitted a memorandum in response to the fifth meeting (SB005). We had hoped for a clear and honest response regarding why the *ex-post tonne-year* method was not chosen. Several stakeholders, including us, expressed their confusion about this decision. Without a detailed response from your side, we fear that it may lead to speculation that your committee and the organization you represent are influenced by lobby groups prioritizing their interests over the environment. We implore you not to make the mistakes of those before you who were swayed by business interests and economic concerns. This is the primary reason for the climate crisis we currently face. In the voluntary carbon markets, stakeholders, including sellers, buyers, and certifiers, often promote business interests rather than environmental concerns. Listen to the science; it is clear, accessible, and available for anyone willing to make an effort to understand it. You will see that the *ex-post tonne-year* method should be integrated into the Article 6.4 mechanism.

Regarding the carbon budget argument, as extensively discussed in scientific and climate policy literature, reversible removals provide value by (a) serving as urgent temporary measures to steer the warming trajectory away from unknown tipping points and risks; (b) serving as economic measures to prevent and minimize global economic damages; (c) offering option value measures that enable anticipated and unanticipated technological, economic, and political advancements leading to accelerated emissions reductions in the near and mid-term. Raising the issue of the carbon budget against these measures is irrelevant and does not support global climate action. Permanent removals, while desirable for climate repair, are not currently available and will not serve the objectives of the 6.4 mechanism when they do become available.

Considering the scientific literature, documents, analyses, and references to scientific papers reviewed by the SB, we find it difficult to accept the SB's conclusion as presented in their report. We would appreciate it if the SB could provide a detailed analysis forming the basis of their conclusion that *ex-post tonne-year* accounting is unsuitable for "international applications" and lacks "effectiveness at addressing reversals." If not, our conclusion, shared by many other organizations, often referred to as the silent majority, will be that the SB was not transparent in this process, exhibited bias from the beginning, and primarily aimed to serve certain business interests.

Best regards,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'William Métivier', with a horizontal line underneath.

William Métivier, f.eng.
President, Forair