Call for public input – Template for input	A6.4-SB009-A01 (methodologies) or A6.4-SB009-A02 (removals
--	--

Name of submitter:	Finn Gru	ndmann,	Mariana	<u>Sánchez</u>
Tapia				

Affiliated organization of the submitter (if any): <u>44.moles GmbH</u>

Contact email of submitter: <u>finn@44moles.com</u>

Date: _____<u>11 April 2024</u>___

Legend for Columns

- **0** = A6.4-SB009-A01 (methodologies) or A6.4-SB009-A02 (removals)
- **1** = Section Number in the document

2= Paragraph number

- **3** = Comment the actual feedback or observation, including justification for what needs changing
- **4** = Proposed change suggest the text if possible

0	1	2	3	4
Meths or Removals	Section no.	Para. no.	Comment	Proposed change (Include proposed text)
A6.4-SB009- A01	3	5	We advocate for a clearer differentiation between reductions and removals within the overall structure of Article 6.4's regulatory framework. This distinction guarantees transparency and modularity in the mechanism. Modularity ensures that the vastly different needs of activities, proponents, and stakeholders are met, while transparency allows modules to learn from one another. Our proposed change would make the framework, the registry, and future guidelines more accessible, ensuring broad participation and engagement.	To differentiate A6.4ER's into Net Removals (A6.4NR?) and Emission Reductions (ER)
A6.4-SB009- A02	2.1	5b	Furthermore, it is imperative that the scope of Article 6.4 clearly defines activity types it does and does not regulate, in order to garner stakeholders support and financing for the development of A6.4 activities. Paragraph 5b defines removals in accordance with the IPCC AR-6 WG III technical summary, thereby excluding activities that use "natural CO2 uptake not directly caused by human activities." This definition, while simple and apparently efficient, gatekeeps participation and inhibits the development of global solutions. To prove that human activity "causes" the uptake of CO2 is scientifically impossible. Activity proponents could merely showcase that human activity correlates with an increased uptake of CO2. Especially in an ecological context, showcasing causality would make the development of projects under Article 6.4 impossible.	The mechanism should explicitly state that nature-based solutions fall under Article 6.4, as long as the activity fulfils all the mechanism requirements. All activities shall significantly increase the removal of CO2, whether human activity is directly or indirectly involved.
A6.4-SB009- A01	4.8	54	In response to the development of methodologies for broad participation, as well as broad sectoral, and geographical coverage, the Supervisory Body recommends to "avoid complexity" While the intention is clearly the applicability of methodologies to a wide range of activities, the avoidance of complexity might lead to the contrary. Especially, when developing projects with complex ownership structures, involving indigenous communities, and national policies, the simplistic nature of current voluntary standards rather prevents the development of truly additional and impactful projects. We believe broad and simple methodologies will likely not account for the "context on the ground".	Methodologies should be developed and updated frequently to account for the vast variety of cultural contexts and the complexity of local climate change mitigation.
A6.4-SB009- A01	4.8	55	Limiting the creation of tools to the Supervisory Body goes against the principle of broad participation and encouraging innovation.	All stakeholders involved in A6.4 projects may propose tools, providing the basis for a modular system, where methodologies account for the local context, while using common components (accredited tools) from other methodologies.

Call for public input – Template for input A6.4-SB009-A01 (methodologies) or A6.4-SB009-A02 (removals)					
0	1	2	3	4	
Meths or Removals	Section no.	Para. no.	Comment	Proposed change (Include proposed text)	
A6.4-SB009- A01	4.9	59	Transparency, and objectivity is another crucial aspect that should be endorsed by the Supervisory Body. In allowing "expert judgment" as an alternative to verified sources and scientific data, without defining how and by whom expert judgements are allowed for monitoring purposes the Supervisory Body leaves too much room for bias and unscientific approaches. Specific guidelines must exist to prevent fraud.	We urge the Supervisory Body to provide clear guidelines for the use of "expert judgment" and to draft out transparency guidelines for the entire mechanism.	
A6.4-SB0009- A01	6	89d	The distribution and management of risk is another important aspect of the mechanism. Nesting, as defined in paragraph 89d, should be required by default, to ensure risks are distributed and accounted for collectively. Especially, in the context of the EU, nesting within the EU ETS and the upcoming Carbon Removal Certification Framework could help implement Article 6.4 globally and at scale. Having a specialized Expert Group on this integration could garner support during negotiations at COP29.	Nesting, as defined in paragraph 89d, should be required by default. We propose the creation of an Expert Group to manage the nesting of A6.4 with other global systems	
A6.4-SB009- A02	3.6.3.2	58	Having clear guidelines around liability would set the A6.4 mechanism apart from other standards, streamlining the market and allowing broader participation, especially from least-developed-countries.	The Supervisory Body must provide clear liability guidelines including the regulation of insurance schemes and buffering pools. In least-developed countries the risk of reversals shall be accounted for by buyers, and not by the project developer.	