

**A6.4-SB005-AA-A07**

## Information Note

---

Draft elements for the recommendation on requirements for the development and assessment of mechanism methodologies

Version 01.0



**United Nations**  
Framework Convention on  
Climate Change

## COVER NOTE

### 1. Procedural background

1. The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement (CMA), at its third session, requested the Supervisory Body for the mechanism established by Article 6, paragraph 4, of the Paris Agreement (Article 6.4 mechanism) to elaborate and further develop recommendations, for consideration and adoption by the CMA at its fourth session (November 2022), on the application of the requirements referred to in chapter V.B (titled 'Methodologies') of the rules, modalities and procedures for the mechanism established by Article 6, paragraph 4, of the Paris Agreement (RMP).<sup>1</sup>
2. The CMA, at its fourth session, requested the Supervisory Body to elaborate and further develop recommendations, for consideration and adoption by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement at its fifth session (December 2023). It further requested the Supervisory Body, while developing the recommendations, to consider broader inputs from stakeholders provided in a structured public consultation process.<sup>2</sup>
3. The Supervisory Body, at its fourth meeting, considered the draft recommendation "Requirements for the development and assessment of mechanism methodologies" (hereinafter referred as SB 004 inputs),<sup>3</sup> and agreed that an informal working group on this matter comprising its members and alternate members as well as the secretariat would prepare an information note taking into account the guidance and questions contained in annex 3 to its meeting report,<sup>4</sup> for consideration by the Supervisory Body at its fifth meeting. It further requested the secretariat to launch a call for public input based on those questions, with a view to seeking further input from stakeholders.

### 2. Purpose

4. The purpose of this document is to advance the work to elaborate and further develop draft recommendations, on the basis of the RMP, on the application of the requirements referred to in chapter V.B. (methodologies) of the RMP.

---

<sup>1</sup> See decision 3/CMA.3, paragraph 6(d), for the request, and the annex to 3/CMA.3, for the Rules, modalities and procedures for the mechanism established by Article 6, paragraph 4, of the Paris Agreement, contained in document FCCC/PA/CMA/2021/10/Add.1 available at: <https://unfccc.int/documents/460950>.

<sup>2</sup> See decision 7/CMA.4, paragraphs 21 and 22, for the request, contained in document FCCC/PA/CMA/2022/10/Add.2 available at: <https://unfccc.int/documents/626570>.

<sup>3</sup> See annex 10 of the annotated agenda of the fourth meeting of the Supervisory Body (A6.4-SB004-AA-A10), available at: <https://unfccc.int/event/Supervisory-Body-4>.

<sup>4</sup> See annex 3 of the meeting report of the fourth meeting of the Supervisory Body (A6.4-SB004-A03), available at: <https://unfccc.int/event/Supervisory-Body-4>.

### 3. Current Work

5. The call for inputs from stakeholders was open from 16 March to 11 April 2023. A total of 17 inputs were received as shown in Table 1.<sup>5</sup>

**Table 1. List of stakeholders who responded to the call for public input<sup>(a)</sup>**

No.	Submission date	Stakeholder
1	4-Apr	Ambachew F. Admassie (AA)
2	5-Apr	Unite to Light (UL)
3	5-Apr	Cambridge Centre for Carbon Credits, University of Cambridge (CCC)
4	5-Apr	44.moles GmbH (44M)
5	6-Apr	Carbon Market Watch (CMW)
6	6-Apr	Perspectives Climate Research (PCR); International-Initiative-for-Development-of-Article-6-methodology-tools ((II-AMT)
7	6-Apr	Sylvera (SR)
8	6-Apr	CCS+ Initiative (CCSI)
9	6-Apr	California Air Resources Board (CARB)
10	10-Apr	Microsoft (MS)
11	11-Apr	Carbon Engineering (CE)
12	11-Apr	44.01 (44.01)
13	11-Apr	Cibola Partners (CP)
14	12-Apr	World Bank (WB)
15	12-Apr	Global CCS Institute (GCI)
16	13-Apr	Puro.earth (PE)
17	13-Apr	International Emissions Trading Association (IETA)

<sup>(a)</sup> In-text citations in this document (e.g AA) reference stakeholder comments/inputs made to the call for public inputs.

6. This document includes:
- (a) Text reproduced from the “Information Note: Status of current work on the application of the requirements referred to in chapter V B (Methodologies) of the rules, modalities and procedures,”<sup>6</sup> (hereinafter referred as SB 003 Info Note);
  - (b) New proposals based on SB 004 inputs and public inputs received in response to the SB 004 call for public inputs. In that regard, it should be noted that:
    - (i) New proposals are neither the recommendations of the secretariat nor that of the informal working group of the Supervisory Body but are rather options prepared to facilitate structured discussion by the Supervisory Body. All the

<sup>5</sup> Details of the call for public input and the full submissions are available at: <https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/the-paris-agreement/article-64-mechanism/calls-for-input/sb004-requirements-methodologies>.

<sup>6</sup> See annex 4 of the meeting report of the third meeting of the Supervisory Body (A6.4-SB003-A04), available at <https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/a64-sb003-a04.pdf>.

options may need further analysis and assessment if the Supervisory Body is disposed to pursue them;

- (ii) Secretariat synthesised, paraphrased and grouped the information in the submissions for easy readability and flow of information. In that process, despite the best efforts, some relevant information may have been unintentionally omitted or not correctly represented. Also, it was difficult to fit some information under the prevailing elements and categories. Readers are encouraged to consult the full submissions available at the link included under footnote 5 to fully understand the background and context in which proposals are made in the submissions. These are also listed under the Appendix of this document.
- (iii) Square brackets are used to indicate different opinions or choices in a proposal.

7. Additionally, all inputs received in response to specific questions posed in the SB 004 call for public inputs are summarised in a separate document titled 'Compilation of inputs in response to the "public consultation: Requirements for the development and assessment of mechanism methodologies" and related literature' (A6.4-SB0005-AA08).

#### **4. Subsequent work and timelines**

8. Appendix 1 to 4 of Annex 10 of SB 004 "Requirements for the development and assessment of mechanism methodologies" (A6.4-SB004-AA-A10) had contained the following proposed revised methodologies and tool:
  - (a) "ACM0002: Grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources" and associated methodological tool "TOOL07: Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system";
  - (b) "AMS-I.L.: Electrification of rural communities using renewable energy"; and
  - (c) "AMS-II.G.: Energy efficiency measures in thermal applications of non-renewable biomass"
9. Guidance and questions document referred under paragraph 3, envisaged examples of revision of methodologies or their elements and conclusions from that exercise, pertaining to Land-based removals and Engineering removals. Secretariat initiated this work and will continue to work on the issue and make a recommendation at a future meeting of the Supervisory Body.
10. In relation to interaction of the elements and approaches of the RMP, the Supervisory Body had discussed during SB 003 that some requirements could be grouped to propose approaches and options to meet the requirements together (e.g. "encouraging ambition over time", "Align with the long-term temperature goal of the Paris Agreement", "Contribute to the equitable sharing of mitigation benefits between the participating Parties" could possibly be addressed through common quantitative / qualitative approaches and requirements for the baseline). Subject to the guidance from the Supervisory Body further work may be carried out in this regard.

11. Further work will be carried out to develop draft recommendations based on the guidance that will be received from the Supervisory Body.

**5. Recommendations to the Supervisory Body**

12. The Supervisory Body may wish to consider this document and provide guidance for further work.

<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b>		<b>Page</b>
<b>1. PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND .....</b>		<b>8</b>
<b>2. PURPOSE .....</b>		<b>8</b>
<b>3. BASELINE SETTING .....</b>		<b>8</b>
3.1. Encouraging ambition over time .....		8
3.1.1. SB 003 Info Note extract .....		8
3.1.2. New Proposals .....		9
3.2. Encouraging broad participation .....		10
3.2.1. SB 003 Info Note extract .....		10
3.2.2. New Proposals .....		10
3.3. Being real, transparent, conservative, credible, below business as usual .....		11
3.3.1. SB 003 Info Note extract .....		11
3.3.2. New Proposals .....		11
3.4. Recognizing suppressed demand .....		12
3.4.1. SB 003 Info Note extract .....		12
3.4.2. New Proposals .....		13
3.5. Contributing to the equitable share of mitigation benefits between participating Parties .....		13
3.5.1. SB 003 Info Note extract .....		13
3.5.2. New Proposals .....		13
3.6. Aligning with NDC of each participating Party, if applicable and LT-LEDs, if it has submitted one [and the long-term goals of the Paris Agreement] .....		14
3.6.1. SB 003 Info Note extract .....		14
3.6.2. New Proposals .....		14
3.7. Aligning with long-term temperature goals of the Paris Agreement .....		15
3.7.1. SB 003 Info Note extract .....		15
3.7.2. New Proposals .....		15
3.8. Taking into account policies and measures and relevant circumstances .....		15
3.8.1. SB 003 Info Note extract .....		15

- 3.9. Requirements on baselines ..... 15
  - 3.9.1. SB 003 Info Note extract ..... 15
  - 3.9.2. New Proposals ..... 16
- 3.10. Standardized baselines ..... 17
  - 3.10.1. SB 003 Info Note extract ..... 17
  - 3.10.2. New Proposals ..... 18
- 4. ADDITIONALITY ..... 19**
  - 4.1. SB 003 Info Note extract ..... 19
  - 4.2. New Proposals ..... 20
    - 4.2.1. Definitions ..... 20
    - 4.2.2. Overarching requirements for additionality demonstration in methodologies ..... 21
    - 4.2.3. General approaches for the demonstration of additionality ..... 21
    - 4.2.4. Performance based approaches for the demonstration of additionality ..... 22
    - 4.2.5. Data requirements for the demonstration of additionality ..... 23
    - 4.2.6. Positive list of technologies ..... 23
- 5. LEAKAGE ..... 24**
  - 5.1. SB 003 Info Note extract ..... 24
  - 5.2. New Proposals ..... 25
    - 5.2.1. Definitions ..... 25
- 6. NON-PERMANENCE AND REVERSALS ..... 26**
  - 6.1. SB 003 Info Note extract ..... 26
  - 6.2. New Proposals ..... 26
- 7. POLICIES, MEASURES AND CIRCUMSTANCES ..... 26**
  - 7.1. SB 003 Info Note extract ..... 26
  - 7.2. New Proposals ..... 26
- 8. INCLUDING DATA SOURCES AND ACCOUNTING FOR UNCERTAINTY ..... 27**
  - 8.1. SB 003 Info Note extract ..... 27
- APPENDIX. LIST OF SUBMISSIONS ..... 28**

## 1. Procedural background

1. The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement (CMA), at its third session, requested the Supervisory Body for the mechanism established by Article 6, paragraph 4, of the Paris Agreement (Article 6.4 mechanism) to elaborate and further develop recommendations, for consideration and adoption by the CMA at its fourth session (November 2022), on the application of the requirements referred to in chapter V.B (titled 'Methodologies') of the rules, modalities and procedures for the mechanism established by Article 6, paragraph 4, of the Paris Agreement (RMP).<sup>7</sup>
2. The CMA, at its fourth session, requested the Supervisory Body to elaborate and further develop recommendations, for consideration and adoption by the CMA at its fifth session. It further requested the Supervisory Body, while developing the recommendations, to consider broader inputs from stakeholders provided in a structured public consultation process.<sup>8</sup>
3. The call for inputs from stakeholders was open from 16 March to 11 April 2023. A total of 17 inputs were received as listed under Appendix.<sup>9</sup>

## 2. Purpose

4. The purpose of this document is to advance the work to elaborate and further develop draft recommendations, on the basis of the RMP, on the application of the requirements referred to in chapter V.B. (methodologies) of the RMP.

## 3. Baseline Setting

### 3.1. Encouraging ambition over time

#### 3.1.1. SB 003 Info Note extract

5. Paragraph 33 of the RMP states that 'Mechanism methodologies shall encourage ambition over time'.
6. This requirement shall be implemented through the application of approaches to be elaborated in accordance with further guidance and procedures to be developed by the Supervisory Body, which are relevant and applicable to the implementation of other elements of paragraph 33 of the RMP.

---

<sup>7</sup> See decision 3/CMA.3, paragraph 6(d), for the request, and the annex to 3/CMA.3, for the Rules, modalities and procedures for the mechanism established by Article 6, paragraph 4, of the Paris Agreement, contained in document FCCC/PA/CMA/2021/10/Add.1 available at: <https://unfccc.int/documents/460950>.

<sup>8</sup> See decision 7/CMA.4, paragraphs 21 and 22, for the request, contained in document FCCC/PA/CMA/2022/10/Add.2 available at: <https://unfccc.int/documents/626570>.

<sup>9</sup> Details of the call for public input and the full submissions are available at: <https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/the-paris-agreement/article-64-mechanism/calls-for-input/sb004-requirements-methodologies>.



7. These approaches shall include approaches based on:
  - (a) increasing the stringency of the baselines over time;
  - (b) the implementation of replicable and scalable mitigation activities.
8. Developing Baseline Contraction Factors (BCFs) to periodically adjust the baseline downwards, is one way of implementing more stringent baselines over time. BCFs could be developed by the Supervisory Body at the request of the host Party or could be developed by the host Party and approved by the Supervisory Body. A procedure [will][could] be established to guide the development of BCFs including the process for consultation with the host Party.
9. Approaches to include progressively more efficient and less GHG intensive technologies in programmes, or activities which expand the user base of project technologies or greater penetration among potential end users, or expansion of geographical sectoral coverage, are potential ways of supporting replicability and scalability of mitigation activities.
10. The Supervisory Body shall develop further guidance on the applicability and/or procedures on the implementation of these approaches.

### 3.1.2. New Proposals

11. The mechanism methodologies should encourage ambition over time by:
  - (a) Removing barriers to deployment of clean technologies, reducing the cost of decarbonization and unlocking investment in low-carbon solutions (IETA)<sup>10</sup>;
  - (b) Enabling an expanded user base of low-carbon solutions after initial deployment (IETA).
  - (c) Continually improving methodologies [based on current science and research] [along progressively conservative science-based pathways that lead to targets based on the 2030 and 2050 Paris goals (AA)] through updates of methodologies [at predetermined regular intervals] [at least every 5 or 10 years], and in relation to alternatives (CARB) (44M);
  - (d) Including default discounting of baseline emissions (WB) (IETA):
    - (i) by an appropriate factor (e.g. technology improvement factor) or net-to-gross adjustment to the emission reductions differentiated by activity type, sector and region; and
    - (ii) by country-specific discounting of baseline emissions linked to the host Party's NDC and associated targets from the host Party;
  - (e) Unleashing projects that can transform an entire sector, as opposed to incremental improvements, including through application of robust baseline contraction factors that take into account the specifics of a sector, geographical location and level of

---

<sup>10</sup> In-text citations in this document, reference stakeholder comments/inputs made to the call for public inputs.

uncertainty of GHG estimation in relation to the technology or practice covered by the methodology (CMW);

- (f) Digitizing methodology elements, including monitoring parameters, to avoid human error, bias and uncertainty, through automation, where feasible, balancing costs and uncertainty (AA);

## 3.2. Encouraging broad participation

### 3.2.1. SB 003 Info Note extract

12. Paragraph 33 of the RMP states that the ‘Mechanism methodologies shall encourage broad participation’.
13. Supervisory Body should encourage development of a broad range of methodologies covering wide set of mitigation technologies and measures. Mechanism methodologies should encourage broad participation by being simple, clear and applicable for broad sectoral and technology coverage. Mechanism methodologies should encourage participation of a broad range of stakeholders during the methodology development as described in paragraph 11 of section 2.2 of the SB 003 Info Note.

### 3.2.2. New Proposals

14. Mechanism methodologies should encourage broad participation across all regions and stakeholders by:
  - (a) Avoiding complexity (IETA);
  - (b) Drawing lessons from existing compliance programmes, going beyond the clean development mechanism (CARB);
  - (c) Undertaking continual measures to harmonize methodology requirements across standard-setting bodies (e.g. Integrity Council for the Voluntary Carbon Market) to facilitate greater participation, particularly from the private sector, and avoid a fragmented market with perverse incentives for entities to select methodologies with the lowest transaction cost (MS);
  - (d) Covering as many sectors, technologies and measures/practices as possible, including in the land-use sector (WB);
  - (e) Encouraging participation of a broad range of stakeholders during methodology development, as described in section 3.2.2 of the concept note “Process for the development of methodologies, methodological tools and standardized baselines”;<sup>11</sup> (SB 004 input)
  - (f) Balancing stringency and maximum participation by being simple but highly accurate, such that a wide range of activity participants can apply methodology requirements irrespective of the scientific infrastructure and financial resources available to them (SR);

---

<sup>11</sup> See annex 8 of the annotated agenda of the fourth meeting of the Supervisory Body, available at: <https://unfccc.int/event/Supervisory-Body-4>.

- (g) Taking into account the context on the ground in host Parties, including institutional arrangements, and providing options to facilitate the meeting of requirements, such as by enabling the drawing from multiple data sources to address any data gaps, particularly for lesser developed countries, and use of conservative default values and benchmarked data from comparable regions (AA);
- (h) Allowing flexibility to use all of the performance-based approaches identified in paragraph 36 of the RMP (WB);
- (i) Providing host Parties with practical solutions to address the risk of overselling emission reductions and hence the risk of a Party not meeting its NDC targets (WB).

### **3.3. Being real, transparent, conservative, credible, below business as usual**

#### **3.3.1. SB 003 Info Note extract**

15. Paragraph 33 of the RMP states that the 'Mechanism methodologies shall be real, transparent, conservative, credible, below business as usual'.
16. Mechanism methodologies shall ensure that the results of Article 6.4 activities developed using them, represent actual tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions reduced or removed and shall provide credible methods for estimating emission reductions. Such estimation should be based on up-to-date scientific information and reliable data gathered through robust monitoring methods, excluding extraneous cofactors affecting emission reductions.
17. Mechanism methodologies shall require transparent descriptions of the source of the data used, and disclosure of data sources unless they are confidential, the assumptions made, the references used and the underlying steps deriving the estimates of the results of Article 6.4 activities, where necessary, including equations.
18. Mechanism methodologies shall result in conservative emission reduction estimates, from the measures applied or the options chosen, or assumptions made and shall not overestimate the emission reductions from Article 6.4 activities. Where relevant, the mechanism methodologies shall require the accounting of uncertainty associated with modelled and surveyed data.
19. Mechanism methodologies shall require that the baseline selected following the approach described under section 2.15 of the SB 003 Info Note shall be demonstrated as being below business-as-usual (BAU). For that purpose, the mechanism methodology shall require the identification of the BAU scenario(s) and provide an approach for the calculation of BAU emissions.

#### **3.3.2. New Proposals**

20. BAU can be a technology or practice that has significantly penetrated (more than 20 per cent share of market/usage) in a territory and would continue similarly due to a mandatory requirement or other reasons (AA).
21. "Below BAU" may be estimated as the difference between reference emissions and BAU emissions, where the latter represent plausible emissions in providing the same outputs or service level of the proposed activity in the host Party. Typically, reference emissions are estimated by considering, for example, equipment efficiency higher than that required

by law and regulation or efficiency higher than the equipment/facility that has the highest market share locally in the last three years (SB 003 Input<sup>12</sup>).

22. Mechanism methodologies shall ensure that baselines are real, transparent, conservative, credible and below BAU by:
- (a) Including robust, transparent, and user-friendly measurement, reporting and verification (MRV) systems (CARB);
  - (b) Using performance standards that are data driven and made publicly available (PCR);
  - (c) Including requirements to demonstrate concrete changes in GHG levels, transparently showing each step in the process, including the scientific calculations (44M);
  - (d) Adopting life-cycle approaches and considering embodied emissions where relevant (AA);
  - (e) Choosing the lowest emissions baseline when multiple sources of data and vintages are available to set the baseline (AA);
  - (f) Avoiding double counting risks (AA).

### 3.4. Recognizing suppressed demand

#### 3.4.1. SB 003 Info Note extract

23. Paragraph 33 of the RMP states that the 'Mechanism methodologies shall recognize suppressed demand'.
24. Supervisory Body will recognise suppressed demand, where applicable, by considering that the baseline scenario is not the historical condition, but rather a situation where the baseline equipment or measure cannot realistically provide the level of service required of the Article 6.4 activity and alternative technology that provides the level of service comparable to Article 6.4 activity is assumed/assessed.
25. In context where the baseline equipment or measure cannot realistically provide the level of service of the Article 6.4 activity, the Supervisory Body will recognize alternative technology that provides the level of service comparable to Article 6.4 activity to be the baseline scenario rather than a historical situation.
26. The Supervisory Body will assess if suppressed demand is a plausible situation for a given context on a case-by-case basis and, where relevant, it will recognize suppressed demand by including benchmarks and default factors in specific methodologies that may not be below BAU. Mechanism methodologies may include such factors where relevant for use by activity participant, however activity participants shall not directly estimate suppressed demand while applying a methodology.

---

<sup>12</sup> Annex 06 of the SB 003 annotations (A6.4-SB003-AA-A06), available at <https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/a64-sb003-aa-a06.pdf>.

### 3.4.2. New Proposals

27. In the case of the energy sector, suppressed demand refers to the situation where energy demand is insufficient or not satisfied due to barriers, such as low income or lack of energy infrastructure in relation to users. A satisfied demand indicates that a minimum level of energy services, such as electricity for lighting or heating is met. Due to income effect (i.e. incomes grow over time), energy service demand and consumption would increase, so that even without access to electricity it is likely that energy consumption in the without-project scenario would rise over time. The Supervisory Body may undertake further work on how to measure the level of energy services and, ultimately, how to determine whether there is suppressed demand (CCC).

### 3.5. Contributing to the equitable share of mitigation benefits between participating Parties

#### 3.5.1. SB 003 Info Note extract

28. Paragraph 33 of the RMP states that the 'Mechanism methodologies shall contribute to the equitable sharing of mitigation benefits between the participating Parties'.
29. Mechanism methodologies may specify application of [an approach based on increasing the stringency of the baselines over time under paragraph 14 (a) of the SB 003 Info Note] [approaches identified under paragraphs 14 to 17 of the SB 003 Info Note] so as to ensure that activity will contribute to equitable sharing of mitigation benefits.
30. Mechanism methodologies shall require the activity participants to describe the measures taken to contribute to the delivery of mitigation benefits to the participating Parties in the project design documents.
31. This requirement may also be operationalized through the DNAs, acknowledging that it is their full right to demand an equitable share of benefits as a pre-condition for the approval of activity(ies) and/or authorization of A6.4ERs to achieve their NDCs. Activity participants shall follow any guidance from the DNAs in this regard.

#### 3.5.2. New Proposals

32. The Article 6.4 mechanism methodologies have been designed to contribute to the equitable sharing of mitigation benefits between participating Parties, owing to short-crediting periods and the provision of share of proceeds for adaptation (IETA).
33. The Supervisory Body may develop further guidance regarding the consideration of co-benefits in mechanism methodologies in relation to contributing to the equitable sharing of mitigation benefits between participating Parties (MS).
34. The Article 6.4 mechanism methodologies should contribute to the equitable sharing of mitigation benefits between participating Parties by setting baselines that are well below business-as-usual, including via the application of a BCF (CMW).

### **3.6. Aligning with NDC of each participating Party, if applicable and LT-LEDs, if it has submitted one [and the long-term goals of the Paris Agreement]**

#### **3.6.1. SB 003 Info Note extract**

35. Paragraph 33 of the RMP states that ‘mechanism methodologies shall, in respect of each participating Party, contribute to reducing emission levels in the host Party, and align with its NDC, if applicable, its long-term low GHG emission development strategy, if it has submitted one and the long-term goals of the Paris Agreement’.
36. Mechanism methodologies shall require demonstration that the activity aligns with the latest NDC of the host Party (if applicable) or [encourages] [enables] increasing ambition in the NDCs, and aligns with the LT-LEDs (if it has submitted one) [and the long-term goals of the Paris Agreement].
37. The Supervisory Body will develop further guidance on how this requirement will be demonstrated.

#### **3.6.2. New Proposals**

38. An activity provides ‘target surplus’ if it goes beyond what can reasonably be expected to be part of the host Party’s unconditional NDC measures (PCR).
39. Mitigation activities that fall within the scope of a Party’s conditional NDC may be considered automatically target surplus. If a proposed mitigation activity can reasonably be expected to be part of the host-Party’s measures to reach its unconditional NDC, the activity does not provide a target surplus (PCR).
40. Mitigation activities are “target surplus” when (PCR):
  - (a) The proposed activity type has been previously identified by the host Party to go beyond its efforts for achieving its unconditional NDC (e.g. included in a published host Party approval list or in another formal communication of the relevant national Article 6 authority or specified in its NDC implementation plan); or
  - (b) The degree of implementation of the mitigation action specified in the NDC for the time frame in question to which the proposed activity belongs has been exceeded; or
  - (c) The proposed activity goes beyond the mitigation trajectory of implementation needed for the NDC target; or
  - (d) The marginal costs of the proposed activity are beyond a threshold based on marginal abatement costs of various measures needed for the implementation of the NDC.
41. This element can be demonstrated by the public accounting systems in each national Party working in combination with the Article 6.4 global registry and transparently accounting for mitigation funded by private entities, to encourage contribution towards a nation’s NDC (44M).
42. It is required that the sector represented by the Article 6.4 mechanism activity be within the host Party’s conditional NDC. Otherwise, Article 6.4 income could act as an incentive

to keep certain sectors “outside” a Party’s goals, so that it could continue to create revenue without affecting the targets within its NDC (SR).

### **3.7. Aligning with long-term temperature goals of the Paris Agreement**

#### **3.7.1. SB 003 Info Note extract**

43. Paragraph 33 of the RMP states that ‘Mechanism methodologies shall align with the long-term temperature goal of the Paris Agreement.’
44. Mechanism methodologies shall require demonstration that the activity is aligned with long-term temperature goals of the Paris Agreement.
45. Mechanism methodologies may require the application of ‘approaches’ identified under paragraph 14 to 17 of the SB 003 Info Note so as to ensure that activity aligns with the long-term temperature goal of the Paris Agreement.
46. The Supervisory Body will develop further guidance on how this requirement will be demonstrated.

#### **3.7.2. New Proposals**

47. Mechanism methodologies shall align with the long-term temperature goals of the Paris Agreement by considering emission reductions and removals that deliver mitigation in this decade and avoid creating perverse incentives and/or reward low-ambition NDCs (IETA).
48. Mechanism methodologies shall align with the long-term temperature goals of the Paris Agreement by considering emission reductions and removals that enable decarbonizing at least half of the baseline emissions/emissions intensity until 2030 and that enable 99 per cent (net zero) decarbonization potential for crediting years extending after 2030 (AA).

### **3.8. Taking into account policies and measures and relevant circumstances**

#### **3.8.1. SB 003 Info Note extract**

49. Paragraph 34 of the RMP states that ‘Mechanism methodologies shall take into account policies and measures, and relevant circumstances, including national, regional or local, social, economic, environmental and technological circumstances.’
50. [The Supervisory Body will develop [further] guidance how mechanism methodologies shall take into account policies and measures and relevant circumstances at a future meeting of the Supervisory Body.]
51. [The Supervisory Body will address take into account relevant circumstances when developing guidance at a future meeting of the Supervisory Body.]

### **3.9. Requirements on baselines**

#### **3.9.1. SB 003 Info Note extract**

52. Paragraph 36 of the RMP states that  
  
‘Each mechanism methodology shall require the application of one of the approach(es) below to setting the baseline, while taking into account any guidance by the Supervisory



Body, and with justification for the appropriateness of the choices, including information on how the proposed baseline approach is consistent with paragraphs 33 and 35 above and recognizing that a host Party may determine a more ambitious level at its discretion:

A performance-based approach, taking into account:

(i) Best available technologies that represent an economically feasible and environmentally sound course of action, where appropriate;

(ii) An ambitious benchmark approach where the baseline is set at least at the average emission level of the best performing comparable activities providing similar outputs and services in a defined scope in similar social, economic, environmental and technological circumstances;

(iii) An approach based on existing actual or historical emissions, adjusted downwards to ensure alignment with paragraph 33 above’.

53. Paragraph 27 of the RMP states that ‘A host Party may specify to the Supervisory Body, prior to participating in the mechanism: (a) Baseline approaches and other methodological requirements...’
54. Mechanism methodologies shall justify the appropriateness of the choice(s) made in the methodology for setting the baseline while taking into account guidance on the performance-based approach in the RMP. For the approach based on existing actual or historical emissions, the mechanism methodology may apply [approaches identified under paragraph 14 to 17 of the SB 003 Info Note as an option] [BCF(s) identified under paragraph 15 of the SB 003 Info Note as one option] to adjust the existing actual or historical emissions downwards to ensure alignment with paragraph 33 of the RMP.
55. Mechanism methodology should include provisions to progressively increase the stringency of the baselines applied in the methodology, as applicable.
56. A host Party may determine a more ambitious baseline requirement at its discretion.
57. The Supervisory Body may undertake further assessment and develop further guidance in relation to the baselines at a future meeting of the Supervisory Body.

### 3.9.2. New Proposals

58. **Best available technology (BAT)** – The best available, technically feasible and economically viable technologies and practices, in the context of emission reduction projects, that can be accessed or applied at scale in the relevant sector (IETA) (PCR).
59. **Economically feasible** – Affordable technologies or practices available to an activity participant. (SB 004 Inputs).
60. **Environmentally sound** – An environmentally sound technology or practice that, in the context of the mechanism, is not prevented by law from being used or implemented on the grounds of some environmental unsuitability in the applicable geographic region (SB 004 inputs).
61. If the sector in which an activity is proposed for implementation is characterized by homogeneous production, i.e. outputs, goods or services are comparable, then a BAT that is also economically feasible and environmentally sound may be applied.



- 
62. If the region or the sector shows strongly varying circumstances of the technology or practice (e.g. significant differences in emissions intensity levels) then ambitious benchmarking approaches should be followed (PCR).
63. For an **ambitious benchmark**, determine a performance distribution curve using the most up-to-date data available of all technologies providing similar outputs or services in similar social, economic, environmental and technological circumstances as the proposed activity in the host Party. If host-Party-specific data are not available, data from the region to which the host Party belongs are to be used. Determine an ambitious benchmark, at minimum at the [20th][xth] percentile of the performance distribution curve if the characteristics of the distribution curve show that these percentiles are conservative (PCR).
64. For existing actual or **historical emissions** adjusted downwards, determine an actual or historical emissions baseline and adjust it downwards using a discount factor declining over time. The historical emissions level of the first year needs to be adjusted downwards by at least 5 per cent. Historical data shall not be older than five years and represent at least a three-year historical time series (PCR).
65. The BCF or Paris Goal Coefficient (PGC) applied to the baseline emissions will lead to linearly more stringent baselines over time, reaching net zero at the time of the host Party's net-zero target date (e.g. the PGC would be set at 100 per cent in [2021] [xxxx] and at zero in 2050 for a country whose net-zero target date is 2050). PGC should be considered at a country-level and not at a sectoral level (PCR).
66. Where multiple parameters cumulatively determine baseline emissions, it is insufficient to apply a performance-based approach based on BAT or an ambitious benchmark to some of the parameters but not to others. Performance-based approaches should cover all relevant parameters to arrive at a conservative estimate of baseline emissions (SB 004 Inputs).

### 3.10. Standardized baselines

#### 3.10.1. SB 003 Info Note extract

67. Paragraph 37 of the RMP states that 'Standardized baselines may be developed by the Supervisory Body at the request of the host Party or may be developed by the host Party and approved by the Supervisory Body. Standardized baselines shall be established at the highest possible level of aggregation in the relevant sector of the host Party and be consistent with paragraph 33 above'.
68. A standardized baseline is a baseline developed for a host Party or a group of host Parties on a sub-national, national or group-of-countries basis rather than on an activity basis, to facilitate the calculation of GHG emission reductions and/or the determination of additionality for Article 6.4 activities, while providing assistance for assuring environmental integrity.
69. The approaches for the baselines referred to above under section 2.15 shall also be applied for the development of the standardized baseline.
70. Standardized baselines may be developed by the host Party and approved by the Supervisory Body following an assessment against the procedures for the development of a standardized baseline that shall be developed and approved by the Supervisory Body.

71. [Standardized baselines shall be established at the highest possible level of aggregation in the relevant sector of the host Party. The Host Party and the Supervisory Body should determine the level of aggregation taking into account the following aspects:
- (a) A default level of aggregation shall comprise the facilities or equipment producing the similar type of output within the geographical boundaries of one Party. The level of aggregation may be expanded to a group of Parties with similar circumstances relating to the output;
  - (b) A default group of facilities should be disaggregated when significant dissimilarities exist in the performance of facilities or groups of facilities in the country/region. In this case, the disaggregation shall be carried out according to relevant criteria, such as production scale, installed capacity or age of the facilities, and standardized baselines values should be determined for each group of similar facilities;
  - (c) Disaggregation should not result in standardized baselines with overlapping applicability.]
72. Standardized baselines may include a [default] validity period of three years, starting from the date of approval by the Supervisory Body. A host Party may propose a shorter or longer validity period taking into account specificity of sectors in which activities are undertaken, and by providing justification for the consideration of the Supervisory Body.
73. After the validity of a standardized baseline has expired, the updated standardized baseline shall be considered by the Supervisory Body subject to host Party making a request for the update. The updated standardized baseline shall not impact already registered activities up to the end of their first crediting period.
74. The Supervisory Body may develop and approve separate guidance on standardized baselines at a future meeting of the Supervisory Body.

### 3.10.2. New Proposals

75. A standardized baseline is a baseline developed for a host Party ~~[or a group of host Parties]~~ on a sub-national or national ~~[or group of countries]~~ basis rather than on an activity basis, to facilitate the calculation of GHG emission reductions and/or the determination of additionality for Article 6.4 mechanism activities, while providing assistance for assuring environmental integrity (SB 004 Inputs).
76. Standardized baselines shall be established at the highest possible level of aggregation in the relevant sector of the host Party. The Host Party and the Supervisory Body should determine the level of aggregation taking into account the following aspects (SB 004 Inputs):
- (a) A default level of aggregation shall comprise the facilities or equipment producing a similar type of output within the geographical boundaries of the Party. ~~The level of aggregation may be expanded to a group of Parties with similar circumstances relating to the output;~~
  - (b) A default group of facilities should be disaggregated when significant dissimilarities exist in the performance of facilities or groups of facilities in the country/region. In this case, the disaggregation shall be carried out according to relevant criteria,

such as production scale, installed capacity or age of the facilities, and standardized baselines values should be determined for each group of similar facilities;

(c) Disaggregation should not result in standardized baselines with overlapping applicability.

77. Standardized baselines can make mechanism more easily accessible to a broader range of stakeholders by reducing the cost of proving additionality and determining crediting baselines (CE) (IETA), however, their application is not mandatory. Activity participant may establish additionality and baseline emissions for their activity as an alternative to applying a standardized baseline (IETA).

78. The Supervisory Body may develop guidance on eligibility of standardized baselines for a group of Parties at a future meeting of the Supervisory Body (SB 004 inputs)

## 4. Additionality

### 4.1. SB 003 Info Note extract

79. Paragraph 38 of the RMP states that ‘Each mechanism methodology shall specify the approach to demonstrating the additionality of the activity. Additionality shall be demonstrated using a robust assessment that shows the activity would not have occurred in the absence of the incentives from the mechanism, taking into account all relevant national policies, including legislation, and representing mitigation that exceeds any mitigation that is required by law or regulation, and taking a conservative approach that avoids locking in levels of emissions, technologies or carbon-intensive practices incompatible with paragraph 33 above’.
80. Paragraph 39 of the RMP states that ‘The Supervisory Body may apply simplified approaches for demonstration of additionality for any least developed country or small island developing State at the request of that Party, in accordance with requirements developed by the Supervisory Body’.
81. Additionality assessment shall require that the activity participants take a conservative approach that avoids locking in levels of emissions, technologies or carbon-intensive practices incompatible with the requirements discussed under sections related to the “Aligning with long-term temperature goals of the Paris Agreement” and “Encouraging ambition over time”.
82. Mechanisms methodology shall require that additionality demonstration of the article 6.4 activity is established by showing that:
- (a) Without the incentive from the mechanism, the activity would not be feasible; and
  - (b) The activity represents mitigation that exceeds any mitigation that is required by law or regulation.
83. The Supervisory Body may approve a list of technologies that are considered additional and termed as positive list of technologies. Mechanism methodologies should require that the activity participant demonstrate that that the proposed article 6.4 activity is part of the positive list of technologies established by the Supervisory Body in order to use the positive list for the demonstration of additionality.

84. The Supervisory Body will consider the technologies for which necessary conditions exist with a high degree of certainty in accordance with the requirements in paragraph 82 above, where relevant on a regional basis, considering special circumstances of LDCs/SIDS, as the basis for developing the positive list.
85. The Supervisory Body will develop further guidance on the demonstration of additionality and the positive list of technologies at a future meeting of the Supervisory Body, including simplified approaches for demonstration of additionality for any LDCs/SIDS.

## 4.2. New Proposals

### 4.2.1. Definitions

86. Definitions included below are applicable together with the requirements specified in this document:
- (a) **Applicable geographical area** – The entire host Party by default. Activity participants shall provide justification on the choice of geographical area when choosing a specific subnational jurisdiction, such as a province (e.g. essential distinction between the identified specific geographical area and the rest of the host country) (SB 004 Inputs);
  - (b) **Emissions intensive practice/technology<sup>13</sup>** – A practice/technology that has a GHG emissions intensity per unit of production/consumption or service that exceeds the intensity of the lowest emitting, [technically feasible and commercially available] [economically feasible and environmentally sound] practice/technology for the production/consumption or service delivered (SB 004 Inputs);
  - (c) **Locking in levels of emissions, technologies or carbon-intensive practices incompatible with paragraph 33 of the RMP (hereafter locking in emissions)** – [Occurs when the proposed activity is an emissions intensive practice/technology that leads to prolongation of the lifetime and use of technologies, practices and infrastructure that indirectly or directly emit GHGs];
    - (i) [Occurs when outdated methodologies are applied, producing inaccurate results identified by large up-front costs but low mitigation (44M)];
    - (ii) [Is avoided when an activity promotes low-emission and sustainable development pathways aligned with the long-term goals of the Paris Agreement (IETA)];
    - (iii) [Are technologies with a lifetime beyond 2030 but which do not lead to net-zero emissions (AA)];
  - (d) **Relevant law/regulation** – Any legally binding laws, rules, mandates, regulations, statutes, agreements or other legal requirements in force at the national, subnational or local levels applicable to the proposed activity, and that require technological, performance or management actions. These legal requirements may, for example, require the use of a specific technology, meeting a certain standard of performance, or managing operations according to a certain set of criteria or practices; overarching policy targets or generic plans without specified

---

<sup>13</sup> The terms practice, measure and technology are used interchangeably in this document.

instruments or means of implementation are not considered included under the definition (SB 004 Inputs);

- (e) **Regulatory surplus** – The emission reductions that an activity aims to achieve which is over and above what is mandated by a relevant law/regulation in effect as of the activity start date. In determining whether an action is surplus to regulations, the activity participants do not need to consider voluntary agreements without an enforcement mechanism, optional guidelines or general government policies (SB 004 Inputs);
- (f) **Start date of the activity** – The date on which the activity participants commit to making expenditures for the undertaking of the activity, or for the construction or modification of the main equipment or facility associated with the activity, or for the provision or modification of a service associated with the activity. Where a contract is signed for such expenditures, it is the date on which the contract is signed. In other cases, it is the date on which such expenditures are made (SB 004 Inputs).

#### 4.2.2. Overarching requirements for additionality demonstration in methodologies

87. For additionality demonstration, Article 6.4 mechanism methodologies shall require that (SB 004 Inputs):

- (a) Only mitigation activities that would not be undertaken without the incentive from the carbon market are eligible; and
- (b) Only emission reductions that are surplus over what would have occurred under current laws and regulations and current industry practices are eligible; and
- (c) Only mitigation activities that do not lead to locking in levels of emissions, technologies or carbon-intensive practices incompatible with paragraph 33 of the RMP are eligible.

#### 4.2.3. General approaches for the demonstration of additionality

88. Mechanism methodologies shall require that the proposed activity is above and beyond BAU, and that the activity is not common practice in the relevant industry, sector and geographic region and that the activity would face one or more barriers to its implementation (e.g. financial, technological or institutional). (SB 004 Inputs)

89. Mechanism methodologies may require the following assessments to demonstrate additionality, either by specifying directly or through the application of an additionality tool that may be developed by the Supervisory Body (SB 004 Inputs):

- (a) **Prior consideration test:** a public notification, prior to the start date of the activity, of the intent to earn carbon market revenue (SB 004 Inputs);
- (b) **Regulatory surplus test:**
  - (i) The enforcement rates of laws and regulations [should be considered (IETA)] [should not be taken into account (CARB) (PCR)];
  - (ii) New laws and regulations enforced during the crediting period should be considered at the time of renewal of the crediting period (IETA, CARB);

- (c) Locking in emissions test (SB 004 Inputs);
- (d) Target surplus test (see section “3. Baseline Setting” for details) (PCR);
- (e) First of its kind test: to check whether the activity is the first in the applicable geographic area to apply a technology/measure that is different from technologies/measures implemented by any other mitigation activities that are able to deliver the same output as the proposed activity (SB 004 Inputs);
- (f) Common practice test: to check whether there is a widespread deployment of the technology/measure or practice in the industry/sector within the relevant geographic area. The level of penetration that represents common practice may differ between sectors and geographic areas, depending on the diversity of baseline candidates (SB 004 Inputs);
- (g) Barrier tests: to check whether there are factors that would prevent the adoption of the proposed activity. It may include (SB 004 Inputs):
  - (i) Financial barrier test or investment analysis to check whether the activity faces financial constraints that carbon funding is expected to resolve to enable implementation of the activity;
    - a. If the activity type is implemented frequently without incentives from the mechanism, then an investment analysis step shall be mandatory. The investment analysis requires the identification of what is a financially viable and realistic alternative(s) to the mitigation activity in similar social, economic and regional contexts. The value of the economic assessment parameter (e.g. internal rate of return (IRR), payback period) at which a mitigation activity would not be deemed economically or financially feasible, considering all revenues and savings generated by the mitigation activity, can be the basis of comparison (PCR);
  - (ii) Technological barriers test: to check whether the activity faces significant technological barriers, such as risk of technology failure or R&D deployment risk, lack of trained personnel and supporting infrastructure for technology implementation, or lack of knowledge about the practice/activity, in comparison to other technologies providing similar outputs or services, and whether carbon market incentive is a key element in overcoming these barriers (SB 004 Inputs);
  - (iii) Institutional barriers test: to check whether the activity faces significant organizational, cultural or social barriers to implementation, and whether carbon market incentive is a key element in overcoming those barriers (SB 004 Inputs).

#### 4.2.4. Performance based approaches for the demonstration of additionality

90. Mechanism methodologies may specify performance standards to qualify proposed activities as additional, i.e. additionality is demonstrated by showing that a proposed activity is surplus to regulations and meets or exceeds a performance standard as defined

in an approved methodology. A performance-based standard may be practice based, a technology standard, or an emission rate or benchmark (SB 004 Inputs):

- (a) Practice based method: Entails evaluating the adoption rates or penetration levels of a particular practice in a relevant industry, sector or sub-sector. If the adoption rates or penetration levels are sufficiently low, and thus it is determined the proposed activity is not common practice, then the activity is considered additional. Specific thresholds may vary by industry, sector, geographis area and practice, and are specified in the relevant methodology (SB 004 Inputs);
- (b) Technology standard: Installation of a particular GHG-reducing technology may be determined to be sufficiently uncommon that simply installing the technology is considered additional (SB 004 Inputs);
- (c) Emission rate or benchmark (e.g. in tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub>e emissions per unit of output): With examination of sufficient data to assign an emission rate that characterizes the industry, sector, subsector or typical land management regime, the net GHG emissions/removals associated with the activity, in excess of this benchmark emission rate, may be considered additional and credited (SB 004 Inputs).

#### 4.2.5. Data requirements for the demonstration of additionality

91. Mechanism methodologies shall require that (SB 004 Inputs):

- (a) Activity participants transparently list and describe the sources of data considered (e.g. peer-reviewed literature, test results, official reports/statistics) and justify the choices made (i.e. sources used are clearly indicated with justifications showing that the values selected and their sources, are appropriate, applicable and conservative); and
- (b) The means used to demonstrate additionality result in consistent and reliable results for the same set of conditions on the ground, and that the results can be validated, i.e. the reliability and credibility of all assumptions, data and calculation methods of parameters, including any qualitative information and justifications of choices made between different sources of data, are independently validated and transparently documented; and
- (c) Cross-checking of the information with available independent sources is undertaken to enhance reliability; and
- (d) Any comments received during public consultations on an activity are effectively addressed.

#### 4.2.6. Positive list of technologies

92. **Positive list of technologies** – Are activities deemed automatically additional when applicable conditions are satisfied.

- (i) **Global positive lists** contain activity types that, under all contexts, can show that their net present value of costs significantly exceeds (e.g. by at least 25 per cent) revenues and savings without carbon finance (PCR);
- (ii) Activity types that can show, in the national context, that their costs exceed revenues and savings (e.g. their marginal abatement cost exceeds a country-



specific benchmark value) and that they have very low penetration rates (e.g., less than 2 per cent) are eligible to be put on a **national positive list (PCR)**;

(iii) A positive list may be based on market penetration for a new technology (PE). It may be region specific (CMW) or global (IETA) and periodically reviewed (IETA);

(iv) Positive lists should be developed based on inputs from experts and public and should include independent assessment and validation (PCR);

93. The Supervisory Body shall ensure that (SB 004 Inputs):

(a) Automatic additionality through positive lists included in mechanism methodologies shall only be applicable to activity types where there is a high degree of certainty that the activity would not occur without carbon market revenues; and

(b) Procedures are in place to review the continued applicability of underlying conditions of the positive lists at regular intervals and to update the positive lists as necessary.

94. Host Parties may propose national positive lists for the consideration of the Supervisory Body, where necessary using the process for the development of standardized baselines.

## 5. Leakage

DRAFT

### 5.1. SB 003 Info Note extract

95. Paragraph 33 of the RMP states that the 'Mechanism methodologies shall avoid leakage, where applicable'.

96. Leakage is the net change of anthropogenic emissions by sources of greenhouse gases (GHGs) which occurs outside the project boundary, and which is measurable and attributable to the Article 6.4 activity, as applicable.

97. Mechanism methodologies shall:

(a) Ensure that the potential sources of leakage in a typical activity covered by the mechanism methodology are identified, including, but not limited to, used equipment transferred outside of the project boundary and diversion of resources from other activities, or diversion of production or service provision;

(b) Include provisions to avoid or minimize all sources of leakage as far as possible;

(c) Quantify the leakage that cannot be avoided and deduct it from the emission reduction achieved by the Article 6.4 activities;

(d) Require the activity participant to follow any guidance from the designated national authority (DNA) of the host Party on leakage, where available.

98. For some classes of activities, monitoring at jurisdictional level may be necessary to quantify and account for leakage. In addition, further work will be required to assess the implications of activities implemented outside national borders and transboundary



activities. Supervisory Body will develop further guidance in this regard at a future meeting of the Supervisory Body.

## 5.2. New Proposals

99. To account for some types of leakage, such as the diversion of resources from other activities, [or diversion of production or service provision], Article 6.4 mechanism methodologies may specify the use of a standardized baseline in place of an activity-level baseline, or integration under a regional monitoring system, which would ensure that an activity's impact on regional emissions is taken into account. The Supervisory Body will develop guidance categorizing activities for which such an approach is required. This may include, but not be limited to, the power sector (e.g. combined margin method, standardized baselines) and Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use (AFOLU) sectors.
100. Mechanism methodologies may specify one or more of the following measures to avoid or minimize leakage:
- (a) Including incentives and requirements for scrapping of baseline equipment substituted by the activity, certified by an independent third party using a standard form of certification that shall make provisions for the unique identification of the equipment destroyed;
  - (b) A lifecycle assessment of the impact of an activity and robust monitoring systems and integrated registries (IETA);
  - (c) At the project level, inspection of the area surrounding a project, a "leakage belt", to assess the impact of the activity over time, which can be addressed through discounting of emission reductions (44M);
  - (d) Assessing whether there are harmonized cross-national policies or matching commitment agreements (44M).
101. Mechanism methodologies should specify approaches for accounting and compensating for reversals [or] approaches for avoiding or reducing non-permanence risks in relation to activities reducing or eliminating non-renewable biomass (e.g. activities introducing clean cooking to substitute non-renewable biomass) (CMW).
102. Mechanism methodologies may require the estimation of emissions during the construction [and embodied emissions in the materials used by the activity] as project emissions (CCC) where necessary using Life Cycle Assessment (SR).

### 5.2.1. Definitions

103. **Shift of baseline equipment or used equipment transfer** – Pre-project activities and equipment are shifted or transferred outside the project boundary, potentially leading to increased emissions due to leakage (SB 004 Inputs);
104. **Diversion of resource materials from other activities** – Diversion of input materials (fuel or feedstock) to the activity may lead to other activities or users shifting to a more carbon intensive source (SB 004 Inputs);
105. **Nesting** – The inclusion of a climate policy introduced at a lower jurisdictional level in a programme implemented at a higher jurisdictional level. Nesting of activities at different governance levels and by public and private actors can be part of a jurisdictional

programme that provides governments the tools needed to account for leakage at the aggregate level, while driving corporate investment (SB 004 Inputs).

## 6. Non-permanence and reversals

### 6.1. SB 003 Info Note extract

106. Paragraph 34 of the RMP states that ‘Mechanism methodologies shall address reversals, where applicable’.
107. “Reversal” means the release into the atmosphere of the verified tonnes of removals.
108. Mechanism methodologies shall address reversals of removals using a consistent approach specified under the recommendations on removals.

### 6.2. New Proposals

109. Mechanism methodologies should address the risk of non-permanence and reversals through the implementation of pooled buffers, which should be based on the actual risk for each specific activity and in each geographical area (IETA) (44M). Buffer pools to account for non-permanence should be maintained throughout the duration of low-durability project lifetimes as should monitoring for reversals (MS).
110. Mechanism methodologies may require that biological and geological carbon cycles be managed separately considering that carbon dioxide removal methods have different risks of reversal (MS) and the methodology may specify the calculation of an “equivalence period”, after which storage for that period is deemed equivalent to an emission reduction. After the calculated period has expired the reversal would no longer be considered to have a negative impact on the climate (PCR).

## 7. Policies, measures and circumstances

### 7.1. SB 003 Info Note extract

111. Paragraph 34 of the RMP states that ‘Mechanism methodologies shall take into account policies and measures, and relevant circumstances, including national, regional or local, social, economic, environmental and technological circumstances.
112. [The Supervisory Body will develop [further] guidance how mechanism methodologies shall take into account policies and measures and relevant circumstances at a future meeting of the Supervisory Body.]
113. [The Supervisory Body will address taking into account relevant circumstances when developing guidance at a future meeting of the Supervisory Body.]

### 7.2. New Proposals

114. Mechanism methodologies should consider local conditions (e.g. the determination of waste products from industrial processes or the market penetration for new technologies) (PE).

115. The Supervisory Body may develop further guidance on modalities for eligibility of policy crediting to incentivize increased ambition and mitigation at large scale (WB), acknowledging that the approaches for crediting the introduction of policies is inherently different from crediting of projects or programmes (PCR).

## **8. Including data sources and accounting for uncertainty**

### **8.1. SB 003 Info Note extract**

116. Paragraph 34 of the RMP states that ‘Mechanism methodologies shall include relevant assumptions, parameters, data sources and key factors’.
117. The Supervisory Body should ensure that the mechanism methodologies are transparent, comprehensive and comprehensible and include relevant assumptions, parameters, data sources and key factors. Where relevant, requirements shall be expressed in terms of performance rather than specification of a product, and these requirements should be verifiable.
118. If it is necessary to invoke a requirement in a methodology that appears elsewhere in another methodology, this should be done by reference and not by repetition. If a test method or a procedure is, or is likely to be, applicable to two or more methodologies, a tool shall be prepared on the method itself, and each methodology shall refer to it to prevent potential deviations on account of repetitions.

DRAFT

## Appendix. List of submissions

**Table 1. Stakeholders that responded to the call for public input**

No.	Stakeholder	Submission date	Link to submission
1	Ambachew F. Admassie (AA)	4-Apr	<a href="https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/Methodologies_requirements_input_AmbachewAdmassie.pdf">https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/Methodologies_requirements_input_AmbachewAdmassie.pdf</a>
2	Unite to Light (UL)	5-Apr	<a href="https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/Methodologies_requirements_input_UTL.pdf">https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/Methodologies_requirements_input_UTL.pdf</a>
3	Cambridge Centre for Carbon Credits, University of Cambridge (CCC)	5-Apr	<a href="https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/Methodologies_requirements_input_Cambridge.pdf">https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/Methodologies_requirements_input_Cambridge.pdf</a>
4	44.moles GmbH (44M)	5-Apr	<a href="https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/Methodologies_requirements_input_44moles.pdf">https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/Methodologies_requirements_input_44moles.pdf</a>
5	Carbon Market Watch (CMW)	6-Apr	<a href="https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/Methodologies_requirements_input_CMW.pdf">https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/Methodologies_requirements_input_CMW.pdf</a>
6	Perspectives Climate Research (PCR); International-Initiative-for-Development-of-Article-6-methodology-tools (II-AMT)	6-Apr	<a href="https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/Methodologies_requirements_input_PCR.pdf">https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/Methodologies_requirements_input_PCR.pdf</a>
7	Sylvera (SR)	6-Apr	<a href="https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/Methodologies_requirements_input_Sylvera.pdf">https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/Methodologies_requirements_input_Sylvera.pdf</a>
8	CCS+ Initiative (CCSI)	6-Apr	<a href="https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/Methodologies_requirements_input_CCS.pdf">https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/Methodologies_requirements_input_CCS.pdf</a>
9	California Air Resources Board (CARB)	6-Apr	<a href="https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/Methodologies_requirements_input_CARB.pdf">https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/Methodologies_requirements_input_CARB.pdf</a>
10	Microsoft (MS)	10-Apr	<a href="https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/Methodologies_requirements_input_Microsoft.pdf">https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/Methodologies_requirements_input_Microsoft.pdf</a>
11	Carbon Engineering (CE)	11-Apr	<a href="https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/Methodologies_requirements_input_Carbon_Engineering.pdf">https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/Methodologies_requirements_input_Carbon_Engineering.pdf</a>
12	44.01 (44.01)	11-Apr	<a href="https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/Methodologies_requirements_input_4401.pdf">https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/Methodologies_requirements_input_4401.pdf</a>
13	Cibola Partners (CP)	11-Apr	<a href="https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/Methodologies_requirements_input_Cibola_Partners.pdf">https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/Methodologies_requirements_input_Cibola_Partners.pdf</a>
14	World Bank (WB)	12-Apr	<a href="https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/Methodologies_requirements_input_WorldBank.pdf">https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/Methodologies_requirements_input_WorldBank.pdf</a>
15	Global CCS Institute (GCI)	12-Apr	<a href="https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/Methodologies_requirements_input_Global_CCS_Institute.pdf">https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/Methodologies_requirements_input_Global_CCS_Institute.pdf</a>

A6.4-SB005-AA-A07

Information Note: Draft elements for the recommendation on requirements for the development and assessment of mechanism methodologies

Version 01.0

No.	Stakeholder	Submission date	Link to submission
16	Puro.earth (PE)	13-Apr	<a href="https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/Methodologies_requirements_input_PuroEarth.pdf">https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/Methodologies_requirements_input_PuroEarth.pdf</a>
17	International Emissions Trading Association (IETA)	13-Apr	<a href="https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/Methodologies_requirements_input_IETA.pdf">https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/Methodologies_requirements_input_IETA.pdf</a>

DRAFT

---

### Document information

<i>Version</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
01.0	17 May 2023	Published as an annex to the annotated agenda of SB 005.
Decision Class: Regulatory Document Type: Information Note Business Function: Methodology Keywords: A6.4 mechanism, methodologies, regulatory framework		

#### Related documents:

17 May 2023	A6.4-SB005-AA-A08 - Information note: Compilation of inputs in response to the “public consultation: Requirements for the development and assessment of mechanism methodologies” and related literature (version 01.0)
21 February 2023	<a href="#">A6.4-SB004-AA-A10</a> - Draft recommendation: Requirements for the development and assessment of mechanism methodologies (version 3.0) (Zip file: <a href="#">Appendices 1 - 4 to Annex 10</a> )
07 November 2022	<a href="#">A6.4-SB003-A04</a> – Information note: Status of current work on the application of the requirements referred to in chapter V B (Methodologies) of the rules, modalities and procedures (version 1.0)
25 October 2022	<a href="#">A6.4-SB003-AA-A05</a> – Draft recommendation: Requirements for the development and assessment of mechanism methodologies (version 2.0) <a href="#">A6.4-SB003-AA-A06</a> - <i>Information note</i> : Requirements for the development and assessment of mechanism methodologies (version 2.0)
12 September 2022	<a href="#">A6.4-SB002-AA-A07</a> - Draft recommendation: Requirements for the development and assessment of mechanism methodologies (version 1.0) <a href="#">A6.4-SB002-AA-A08</a> - <i>Information note</i> : Requirements for the development and assessment of mechanism methodologies (version 1.0)
08 July 2022	<a href="#">A6.4-SB001-AA-A06</a> - <i>Concept note</i> : Guidelines for implementation of methodological principles, approaches, and methods for the establishment of baseline and additionality (version 1.0)