



CALL FOR INPUT

<i>Name of submitter</i>	Tara O'Shea
<i>Affiliated organization of submitter</i>	Stanford Woods Institute Natural Climate Solutions Initiative
<i>Email of submitter</i>	toshea@stanford.edu
<i>Date of submission</i>	24/07/2026

Document reference number and title: (Recommendation from the MEP to SBM020)

Concept note: Options for implementing the provisions in paragraph 62 of the "Standard: Requirements for activities involving removals under the Article 6.4 mechanism (version 01.0)"

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	-	Cross-cutting	It's great to see the thorough analysis presented in the concept note and I agree that robust mechanisms are needed to address reversal risk. One cross-cutting feedback point is that the concept note often frames the discussion as a choice between buffer pool accounts and the adoption of alternative instruments that must independently provide an equivalent level of assurance. However, these tools can work in complementary ways and I encourage the MEP to consider a broad portfolio-based approach to reversal risk management -- in which buffer pools, insurance products, guarantees, monetary reserves, legal attestations, and monitoring obligations can work together to mutually reinforce reversal remediation goals.	-