



CALL FOR INPUT

Name of submitter	Jean-Guérolé CORNET
Affiliated organization of submitter (if any)	Néosylva Investissement Forestier SAS
Email of submitter	jgcornet@neosylva.fr
Date of submission	23/09/2025

Instruction: **Enter your input in the table below.** Stakeholders **must** submit their comments by the established deadline and strictly use this commenting template to ensure their input is duly considered. The use of AI-generated content is **prohibited**, as such submissions frequently lack relevance and fail to address the specific issues presented in the published documents.

Document reference number and title: A6.4-MEP008-A03. Draft Standard: Addressing non-permanence and reversals (version 02.2)				
Item	Section no. (as indicated in the document)	Paragraph/Table/Figure no. (as indicated in the document)	Comment (including justification for change)	Proposed change (including proposed text)
1	n/a	n/a	It is unclear why appendix 3, which received wide support, was removed from the second version of the draft standard.	Address the removal of appendix 3.
2	Cover note, section 3	Paragraph 11	The MEP states that it received a large number of inputs and “revised the draft standard accordingly”. It is disappointing to see how little the draft standard has actually changed, especially given that a vast number of the responses to the draft standard raised concerns around the same topics (namely, perpetual post-crediting monitoring).	We urge the MEP to take into consideration the input it receives.
3	Cover note, section 3	Paragraph 20-22	Without amending the requirement for perpetual post-crediting monitoring, the MEP does exclude all Nature-based Solutions from participating in article 6.4. This will have direct bad consequences as it will make impossible carbon finance to contribute to forest sustainable management and afforestation, when the forest sector is recognized as of prime importance to tackle climate change issues	Although we embrace a concept note on additional options to terminate post-crediting period monitoring obligations, we suggest that the MEP do away with perpetual post-crediting monitoring (the project must monitor, detect, and report reversals) all together and instead require a fixed period of 60 years if the crediting period is 40 years, in line with international standards.

Item	Section no. (as indicated in the document)	Paragraph/Table/Figure no. (as indicated in the document)	Comment (including justification for change)	Proposed change (including proposed text)
4	Appendix 1 & Appendix 2		<p>We do not support Appendix 1 and 2 - the proposal that post-crediting period monitoring be carried on indefinitely among other requirements means that it will effectively be impossible to develop nature-based carbon removal projects for Article 6.4.</p> <p>In our reading, appendix 1 and 2 not only constitutes a bias towards engineered removals but also risks the achievement of the Paris Agreement goals.</p> <p>Nature-based removals are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The only form of carbon removal widely available and scalable and thus crucial for meeting the goals of the Paris Agreement. • Crucial for combatting climate change more broadly, by restoring ecosystems that provide essential ecosystem services like temperature cooling, flood mitigation, soil health, water filtration and so forth. <p>Investment into these important projects are put at grave risk, and we urge the Methodological Expert Panel to keep in mind the central reference point of the Paris Agreement: achieving the Long-Term Temperature Goal by 2100. To do this we will need rapid carbon removal.</p> <p>It can be added that: laws and rules that define open-ended, indefinite obligations confront legal concerns. Open-ended obligations lack legal precision, are difficult to enforce, result in disproportionate compliance costs and violate legal rules of legal certainty and proportionality.</p>	

Item	Section no. (as indicated in the document)	Paragraph/Table/Figure no. (as indicated in the document)	Comment (including justification for change)	Proposed change (including proposed text)
5	Appendix 2, 3.1	Paragraph 40	<p>Paragraph 40 requires activity participants to continue post-crediting monitoring indefinitely. We are strongly against this rule because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It ignores the timeline of the Paris Agreement, for which Article 6 was designed to help achieve. The reference year of the Paris Agreement is 2100. • This should be the timeline we work on. • Although it does provide options for the termination of this indefinite monitoring, it is almost impossible for Nature-based project to be economically viable and meet these conditions. This means it is effectively impossible for Nature-based removal projects to be eligible under 6.4, while they remain the most widely scalable form of carbon removal in a climate crisis that will require a rapid scale-up of carbon removal. 	We suggest the MEP require a fixed period of 60 years post-credit period monitoring (the project must monitor, detect, and report reversals), if the crediting period is 40 years, in line with international standard.

-- (Please add rows as required) -