Publication Date:
14/11/2023

Version:
V1.0

Contact:
Ecosystem Restoration Standard
25 Rue de Frémicourt
75015 Paris, FRANCE
info@ers.org

TEMPLATE

Standard Revision Request

SUMMARY

The Standard Revision Request is the first step of the Standard Revision Procedure. Based on the feedback collected from all ERS teams, the Secretariat may submit a Standard Revision Request to the TAB, which must outline the projected revisions, their expected scope, timeline, risks, and the Public Comment Period's modalities.

The TAB must answer Standard Revision Requests within 30 consecutive days. If not, they shall be considered as rejected. If the TAB approves the Standard Revision Request, the Secretariat is authorised to draft a Standard Revision Proposition and submit it to the TAB.

Table of *Contents*

REFERENCE

Standard Revision ID: SR001

Issuance date: 01/03/2024

REVISION REQUEST SUMMARY

Standard Revision Request objective & rationale

Summary of what the Standard Revision Request seeks to achieve.

This request seeks to achieve:

- Alignment with CORSIA criteria
- More clarity in the formulations of the Programme and Methodologies
- Integrate stakeholders feedback from first certifications to make the Programme and Methodologies more actionable

This request, if accepted by the TAB, will result in the drafting of a detailed Standard Revision Proposition. Such Proposition, if accepted, will lead to the publication of a V1.1 Programme and Methology.

SCOPE OF REVISION

ID#	Topic	Document	Section & Page	Description
1.1	KYC	Anti-Fraud Policy	Third-Party Due Diligence, p6	Remove VVBs and Buyers in the scope of Due-Diligence and move them to the scope of Third-Party Screening. If a Third-Party Screening leads to suspicion(s), Due-Diligence will be performed.
1.2	KYC	Anti-Fraud Policy	Third-Party Due Diligence, p6	Create a separate due diligence process for Developers, reflecting the diversity of organisation that can be Developers and assessing their capacity to deliver the Project on the ground. Create the associated report template.
1.3	KYC	Anti-Fraud Policy	Third-Party Due Diligence, p6	Remove third-party screening for companies that are already audited annually - ERS will verify their audit report.
2.1	Leakage	M001	Leakage, p27	Clarify the Activity Mapping and the required data. Maintain recalculations in Year 4, but remove any recalculations beyond this point (monitoring via remote sensing only).
2.2	Leakage	Leakage Mitigation Declaration	Activity Shifting, Tab 1	At year 0, include the possibility to directly inform the Displacement Area as an alternative to the percentage of

				displacement of the Activity Area.
2.3	Leakage	Quantification Methodology	Initial Leakage Quantification, p17	Add the calculation option where Developers directly inform the Displacement Area.
2.4	Leakage	Quantification Methodology	Initial Leakage Quantification, p17	Add the possibility to calculate the mean carbon value of the Leakage Belt area with random plots within this area, instead of using the totality of the Leakage Belt area.
3.1	TAB Governance	Technical Advisory Board	Composition - Exclusion, p5	Add the possibility that TAB members may leave their functions without formal reason, upon agreement with the Secretariat.
3.2	TAB Governance	Technical Advisory Board	Meetings, p7	Change TAB meeting frequency from monthly to quarterly and ad-hoc.
3.3	TAB Governance	Technical Advisory Board	Decision-Making, p7	Add a majority vote system and a co-chair mechanism.
4.1	Standard Revisions	Standard Revision Procedure	Submission phase, p4	Remove Standard Revision Requests; allow the Secretariat to directly send Revision Propositions.
4.2	Standard	Standard Revision	Review Phase,	Add the possibility for the R&D and Certification teams to draft Standard

	Revisions	Procedure	p5	content under supervision and validation of the Secretariat and the TAB.
4.3	Standard Revisions	Standard Revision Procedure	Public Comment Period, p6	Add that the TAB must mandate a Public Comment Period for every new methodology release.
4.4	Standard Revisions	Standard Revision Procedure	Public Comment Period, p6	Change the requirements for a Public Comment Period; the TAB will be able to decide grounds for public consultation internally, and no longer be systematically obliged to require a Public Comment Period for changes applied to methods, principles and governance.
5.1	Validation & Verification	Validation & Verification Procedure	General Requirements, p4	Remove the requirement for VVBs to hold valid ISO 14066 accreditation as not necessary for Validation/Verification purposes.
5.2	Validation & Verification	Validation & Verification Procedure	Timeline, p11	Add more details about the permitted delays in the execution of Verification. Detail the process for Projects resuming Verification after a hold period.
5.3	Validation & Verification	Validation & Verification Procedure	Validation, p7	Add SDG Contribution document to the list of Validation/Verification checking.

5.4	Validation & Verification	Validation & Verification Procedure	Accreditation, p17	Add a section on VVBs status: Pending, Inactive, Active.
5.5	Validation & Verification	Validation & Verification Procedure	Audit Process, p11	Modify the sequence of the Validation/Verification process to better align with ISO 14065.
5.6	Validation & Verification	Validation & Verification Procedure	General Requirements, p5	Add requirements about VVBs Quality Management System to better align with ISO 14065.
5.7	Validation & Verification	Validation & Verification Procedure	General Requirements, p5	Add a clause stating that the Procedure can be subject to changes related to specific national laws affecting VVBs.
5.8	Validation & Verification	Validation / Verification Report	TBD	Adapt the Validation/Verification report to align with the planned revisions.
5.9	Validation & Verification	Validation & Verification Procedure	Audit Process, p16	Detail the procedure in case of changes and new discoveries after the Validation/Verification report publication.
5.10	Validation & Verification	Validation & Verification Procedure	Remote Audit Policy, p8	Add the requirement to send a VVB on site in case the satellite imagery is not

				available.
6.1	Carbon Baseline	Quantification Methodology	Dynamic Baseline, p20	Exclude the Leakage Belt area from the selection of control plots when processing the Dynamic Baseline.
6.2	Carbon Baseline	Quantification Methodology	Dynamic Baseline, p20	Add a maximum distance of 100 kilometers from the Project area for control plots.
6.3	Carbon Baseline	Quantification Methodology	Biomass Quantification, p9	Use a regional Root-to-Shoot ratio using the 2019 Refinement to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories
6.4	Carbon Baseline	Quantification Methodology	AGB Provider, p31	Add that Kanop has been chosen as an alternative AGB provider where the current provider (Chloris) cannot provide data.
6.4	Carbon Baseline	Quantification Methodology	TBD	Add an explicit description of the requirements for quality assurance and quality control measures.
7.1	Certification Procedure	Programme	Project Expansion, p38	Add more details in the Project Expansion section; this includes Eligibility Criteria, Project crediting period and Verification schedule, among others.

7.2	Certification Procedure	Programme	Feasibility Study, p24	Allow Projects to move forward to Assessment with contingencies. All contingencies will need to be solved before Validation.
8	Grievances	Programme	Grievance Mechanism, p10	Add that grievances against registry operations or registry administrators must be handled by a third-party to avoid conflicts of interest.
9.1	Additionality	Additionality Sheet	Common Practice, p8	Change the current method to perform Common Practice analysis and replace it by the use of dynamic baselines.

PROVISIONAL TIMELINE

Target deadline for TAB response (30 days) : 30/03/2024

EXPECTED RISKS

List and describe the expected risks associated with the Standard Revision Request.

No risks have been identified by the Secretariat.

Publication Date:
14/11/2023

Version:
V1.0

Contact:
Ecosystem Restoration Standard
25 Rue de Frémicourt
75015 Paris, FRANCE
info@ers.org

TEMPLATE

Standard Revision Request

SUMMARY

The Standard Revision Request is the first step of the Standard Revision Procedure. Based on the feedback collected from all ERS teams, the Secretariat may submit a Standard Revision Request to the TAB, which must outline the projected revisions, their expected scope, timeline, risks, and the Public Comment Period's modalities.

The TAB must answer Standard Revision Requests within 30 consecutive days. If not, they shall be considered as rejected. If the TAB approves the Standard Revision Request, the Secretariat is authorised to draft a Standard Revision Proposition and submit it to the TAB.

Table of *Contents*

REFERENCE

Standard Revision ID: SR002

Issuance date: 18/03/2024

REVISION REQUEST SUMMARY

Standard Revision Request objective & rationale

Summary of what the Standard Revision Request seeks to achieve.

This request supplements SR001 for the forthcoming version of the M001 and the Programme. Its specific aim is to increase efficiency in the Certification process, encompassing the Assessment phase and extending to the entire Project duration through ongoing monitoring.

This request, if accepted by the TAB, will result in the drafting of a detailed Standard Revision Proposition. Such Proposition, if accepted, will lead to the publication of a V1.1 Programme and Methology.

SCOPE OF REVISION

ID#	Topic	Document	Section & Page	Description
1.1	Loss Events Monitoring	Programme	MRV Procedures, p33	ERS is performing a benchmark assessment of models recording land-use changes. The most accurate model will be implemented and replace Global Forest Watch.
1.2	Leakage Monitoring	M001	Leakage, p28	ERS is performing a benchmark assessment of models recording land-use changes. The most accurate model will be implemented and replace Global Forest Watch.
2	Buffer Pool	Programme	Buffer Pool, p44	ERS will offer Developers two options to address reversal risks and ensure Units integrity: either continue contribute to the ERS Buffer Pool or opt for a pre-approved insurance mechanism.
3	Risk Matrix	Risk Assessment Matrix	N/A	Adjust certain risks in the Matrix to enhance assessment accuracy and eliminate any duplicates.

PROVISIONAL TIMELINE

Target deadline for TAB response (30 days) : 18/04/2024

EXPECTED RISKS

List and describe the expected risks associated with the Standard Revision Request.

No risks have been identified by the Secretariat.

Publication Date:

Version:
V1.0

Contact:
Ecosystem Restoration Standard
25 Rue de Frémicourt
75015 Paris, FRANCE
info@ers.org

TEMPLATE

Standard Revision Proposition

SUMMARY

This Standard Revision Proposition is issued by the Secretariat upon approval of a Standard Revision Request. In this document, the Secretariat exhaustively details all the changes that should be implemented to the Standard and its affiliated documents. The Standard Revision Proposition is then submitted to the TAB for review.

Table of *Contents*

REFERENCE

Standard Revision ID: RP001

Issuance date: 02/04/2024

REVISION PROPOSITION SUMMARY

This revision proposition details the SR001 and SR002 revision requests.

REVISIONS

RP#1	
Revision Request	1.1 & 1.3
Document	Anti-Fraud Policy
Section & Page	Section *Third-Party Screening*, Pages 4 and 6
Description	Modification of the scope to include VVBs and Buyers.
Proposition	Modify Guiding Principles page 2: "Financial transactions: Before executing financial transactions of over 50,000 USD, conduct due diligence on Third Parties, especially if these have not undergone this screening process for more than 2 years." Modify Scope page 4: "The Third-Party Screening process applies to all ERS contractors and partners, including, but not limited to, VVBs, Buyers, accounting firms, legal and technical consultancy, insurance services, and suppliers. Third Parties that are already audited annually are exempt from this procedure; in this case, the screening will consist of verifying their audit report. Developers are also exempt as they already undergo a full investigation. " Modify Scope page 6 "This process is the default procedure for Developers. Other Third Parties may only undergo the Third-Party Due Diligence process if they are flagged during the preliminary Third-Party Screening process."

RP#2	
Revision Request	9.1
Document	M001 and Additionality Sheet
Section & Page	M001, section *Additionality*, page 22 Additionality Sheet, section *Common Practice*, page 9
Description	Remove the Common Practice Analysis from all documents. Add the standardised approach concept to the M001.
Proposition	M001: Add to *Additionality* page 22: "ERS has developed a standardised approach for Developers to demonstrate additionality." Additionality Sheet: section *Common Practice*, page 9: remove the whole section.

RP#3	
Revision Request	5.1
Document	Validation & Verification Procedure

Section & Page	N/A
Description	Remove all mentions of ISO 14066 throughout the V&V Procedure. This procedure is not relevant since ERS has already detailed the skills and knowledge required for the audit teams to perform Validation and Verification.

RP#4	
Revision Request	5.3
Document	Validation & Verification Procedure
Section & Page	Section *Validation*, page 7
Description	Specify the set of verifications that must be carried out by VVBs during Validation.

Proposition	"The VVB must validate:
	• That the Certification Procedure defined in the Programme has been followed.
	• That the Project Design Document and its affiliated documents include all M001 requirements on:
	  ○ Eligibility criteria
	  ○ Ecological Recovery
	  ○ Carbon

	○ Livelihoods ○ Risk Assessment ○ Safeguards • The GHG emissions removals quantification. • The Developer Due Diligence.”

RP#5	
Revision Request	5.4
Document	Validation & Verification Procedure
Section & Page	Section *Validation & Verification Bodies Accreditation*, page 18
Description	Add VVB Status.
Proposition	Add to *Accreditation,* page 19: “Every VVB accredited by ERS is listed on the ERS website and classified into one of three specific statuses: Pending, Active, or Inactive. Each status is characterised as follows: • Pending: is assigned to VVBs that are currently undergoing the accreditation process, either for initial approval or for re-approval. • Active: is assigned to VVBs that are accredited and have undergone successful Performance Evaluations, as described in the Performance Evaluation section. • Inactive: is assigned to VVBs that are accredited but that failed

	to pass the Performance Evaluation.”

RP#6	
Revision Request	5.4
Document	Validation & Verification Procedure
Section & Page	Section *Validation & Verification Bodies Accreditation*, page 18
Description	Add two steps between Review and Onboarding.
Proposition	“Application Form: • The ERS Secretariat sends an Application Form to the VVB seeking accreditation. This form consists of a series of questions designed to confirm the VVB's adherence to the criteria outlined in the Requirements section. • The ERS Secretariat evaluates the completed Application Form for compliance. VVB Screening: • The ERS Secretariat sends the Third-Party Screening Questionnaire to the VVB seeking accreditation. • The ERS Secretariat evaluates the completed Questionnaire for compliance following the procedure described in the Anti-Fraud Policy.”

RP#7	
Revision Request	5.4
Document	Validation & Verification Procedure
Section & Page	Section *Validation & Verification Bodies Accreditation*, page 18
Description	Make adjustments to the training and onboarding steps in the VVB Accreditation process.
Proposition	Rename paragraph 3 “Onboarding” to “Training” and add: • “All Audit Team Leaders must follow the training.” • “A knowledge test is sent to every applying auditor to verify their knowledge of the Standard. All auditors must have successfully passed the knowledge test to perform Validation or Verification.” Add a subsequent step: ”Onboarding”: • “Agreement: a Legally Binding Agreement must be signed between ERS and the applying VVB. • Fees: an invoice of 1500€ must be paid by the VVB organisation to cover the costs related to the accreditation process.” Modify Accreditation paragraph: “Once the VVB successfully signs the Legally Binding Agreement, and the invoice is paid, the ERS Secretariat considers the VVB to be accredited and will be listed on the website as Active.”

RP#8	
Revision Request	5.6
Document	Validation & Verification Procedure
Section & Page	Section *General Requirements*, page 4
Description	Add details about ISO 14064-3 general principles and the required Quality Management System.
Proposition	Add definition of ISO principles, following ISO documentation: "VVBs must follow ISO 14064-3 principles, namely: • Impartiality: VVBs must design and execute the Verification/Validation engagement so that it is objective and minimise bias. • Evidence-based approach: VVBs must employ a rational method for reaching reliable and reproducible conclusions, based on sufficient and appropriate evidence. • Fair presentation: VVBs must report all significant obstacles encountered during the process and unresolved, diverging opinions among verifiers or validators. • Documentation: VVBs must ensure the documentation establishes the basis for the conclusion and conformity with the criteria. • Conservativeness: When assessing comparable alternatives, VVBs must adopt a conservative approach to decision-making to ensure the selection of the most appropriate alternative.

	Add: "VVBs must maintain a robust internal Quality Management System: • Policies and Responsibilities: VVBs must strive to maintain clear policies related to Validation and Verification, including clarity in roles and decision-making processes. • Internal Audits: VVBs must undergo regular audits to help identify areas where processes may not conform to planned arrangements, ISO requirements, or the organisation's own requirements. • Corrective Actions: VVBs must strive to identify any non-conformities, take appropriate actions to address them, and manage the results of these actions. • Risks and Opportunities: VVBs must identify, assess, and address risks and opportunities related to their activities, including potential conflicts of interest or biases. • Documented Information: VVBs must maintain and control documented information, ensuring it is adequately protected, accessible when needed, and kept up to date. • Management Review: Top management should periodically review the Quality Management System to ensure its continuing suitability, adequacy, and effectiveness."

RP#9	
Revision Request	5.7
Document	Validation & Verification Procedure

Section & Page	Section *Introduction*, page 3
Description	Add that the Procedure can be subject to national rules.
Proposition	"This Procedure may vary depending on the national context. Should there be any conflict between the Validation and Verification Procedure and national regulations, the VVB must notify the ERS Secretariat within 10 business days promptly. Any deviations will be duly reported in the Validation/Verification Report."

RP#10	
Revision Request	5.10
Document	Validation & Verification Procedure
Section & Page	Section *Remote Audit Policy*, page 9
Description	Clarify the circumstances requiring a site visit.
Proposition	Modify section 4: "Site visits must be performed under the following circumstances: • An initial Verification. • There is suspicion of false data in the documentation. • There is suspicion of breaching one or more of ERS'

	requirements. • Project documentation is poorly done, with missing or unreliable data, geolocation, and/or supporting images, not allowing reasonable assurance. • A material grievance complaint has been filed since the last Verification. • Stakeholders are inaccessible via remote channels. • Material changes in scope or boundary of reporting, i.e. Project expansion."

RP#11	
Revision Request	5.2
Document	Validation & Verification Procedure
Section & Page	Section *Timeline*, page 11
Description	Clarify the time frame allowed for Validation/Verification.
Proposition	Replace the whole section with: "Validation must be completed within a four-month period. This implies that the time span from signing the Project Validation Mandate to publishing the Validation Report on the ERS Registry must not exceed four months. Verification must also be completed within a four-month period. This

implies that the time span from signing the Project Verification Mandate to publishing the Verification Report on the ERS Registry must not exceed four months.

Verification must occur every two years, starting at year four. This implies that the interval between the publication of a Verification Report and the signing of the subsequent Project Verification Mandate must not exceed two years.

Developers can request ERS' Certification Agent to extend the Verification interval to four years instead of two.

- The request must be done via email at least one hundred and eighty (180) days prior to the next Verification scheduled date.
- The request must include a justification to the extension's request.

If the Certification Agent deems there is no material risk associated with a delayed Verification, they can grant the request via email. Material risk includes but is not restricted to:

- Delay superior to two weeks (from the grace period) in sending an Annual Report in the last four years.
- Any grievance filed against the Project in the last eight years.
- Any loss events or reversal in the last two years.
- Suspicion by the Certification Agent of the Project's rightful evolution.

The Certification Agent must publish an Extension Note on the Project's page in the Registry. The Note must contain the request's justification, ERS' decision, the decision's justification, and the new Verification date (if applicable). The Verification's extension can not be applied to years where the Project is undergoing Adaptive Management (years four, eight, twelve, sixteen, and subsequently).

Verification can be delayed up to twelve months due to the following circumstances:

- Inaccessibility of the Project Area: due to environmental

	conditions, travel restrictions, any type of conflicts or logistical challenges. • Regulatory or Policy Changes implying sudden changes in national environmental regulations or carbon accounting frameworks. • Other reasons demonstrated as justifiable by the VVB to the ERS Secretariat. If Verification has not been completed after the initial twelve-month grace period, the VVB must submit a new justification to ERS, including the expected length of the postponement. If ERS deems the justification insufficient, the Project will be placed on hold."

RP#12	
Revision Request	5.5
Document	Validation & Verification Procedure
Section & Page	Section *Audit Process*, page 11
Description	Make adjustments to the process to include the Project Mandate and better align with ISO 14064-3.
Proposition	Modify Pre-engagement page 11: "Pre-engagement: • Pre-selection: ERS Secretariat pre-selects accredited VVBs to

perform Validation or Verification. The Secretariat provides VVBs with Project summary, type of engagement and scope.

- Pre-agreement: The VVB must conduct a review of the information provided. Following such review, the VVB must either accept or decline and provide a provisional team composition with day rates.
- ERS can pre-select multiple VVBs. VVB selection is made by ERS based on the following criteria:
    - Availability on the mentioned time frame
    - Audit Team knowledge and skills, based on auditors' CVs, with a focus on local knowledge (including language proficiency and experience with comparable projects)
    - Day rates of the Audit Team members
    - Previous Performance Evaluations

Modify "Engagement" and "Planning" page 13:

"Planning and Engagement:

Upon selection of the VVB by the ERS Secretariat, the Project Mandate is employed to initiate engagement between ERS and the chosen VVB for Validation or Verification.

- The Project Mandate acts both as a contract and a detailed outline of the Validation or Verification process.
- ERS must pre-fill:
    - Project details: Name; ID; Project Design Document; Risk Matrix; Developer Due Diligence.
    - Validation details: Context; Objective; Engagement Type; Scope; Level of Assurance.
    - References: Programme version, Methodology version, Validation & Verification Procedure version.
- The VVB must complete:
    - The Strategic Analysis as defined by ISO 14064-3
    - The Risk Assessment as defined by ISO 14064-3
    - The team composition along with the

Validation/Verification Fees
    - Evidence-gathering activities
    - Detailed information on site visits (if applicable) including a description of the activities, costs, dependencies, material and preliminary schedule or timeline
    - General Safeguards Declaration section
- Upon reception of the Project Mandate, the VVB must complete it within 20 business days."

Page 13, add a Completion section after Execution:

"Upon executing the Validation/Verification, the VVB is responsible for completing the Validation/Verification Report and sharing it with both the ERS Secretariat and the Developer.

- In the context of Validation:
    - Evaluation: the VVB must evaluate the conformity of the Project Design Document and its affiliated document with the ERS Programme and the chosen Methodology.
    - Report: the VVB must reach a conclusion, draft a first opinion (unmodified, modified, adverse) and report those decisions in the Validation Report. The Report must include a summary of the Validation process, all findings and a Corrective Action Plan.
- In the context of Verification:
    - Evaluation: the VVB must evaluate the sufficiency and appropriateness of evidence, any material misstatements, deviations from the Project Design Document and changes from prior periods.
    - Report: the VVB must reach a conclusion, draft a first opinion (unmodified, modified, adverse) and report those decisions in the Verification Report. The Report must include asummary of the Verification process, all findings and a Corrective Action Plan."

	Page 16, add to the *Rejection* paragraph: "The Developer must submit the revised Corrective Action Plan within 15 business days." Page 14, change the *Decision* section to *Final Opinion* and add to the Handling of appeals & complaints: "VVBs must update the Validation/Verification Report in case changes and new discoveries happen after the report publication. The new version of the Report must be published on the ERS Registry."

RP#13	
Revision Request	5.8
Document	Verification/Validation Report - Template
Section & Page	Section *Findings*, page 8
Description	Page 4, add to the "*Methods*" section of the Validation Process: "Detail the methods, encompassing the evidence-gathering plan, implemented for conducting the Validation. This should include an explanation of the performed activities, evidence-gathering approach, pivotal assumptions, and the reasoning for selecting this specific approach. Include learnings from what types of verification methods were not possible to be performed, the rationale behind this, and how this affected the overall Report."

	Add a "*Validation Findings*" section with: • Detailed criteria for every section of the M001: Eligibility criteria; Ecological Recovery; Carbon; Livelihoods; Risk Assessment; Safeguards; The GHG emissions removals quantification • The affiliated resource for every criterion. For every criterion, the VVB must inform: • The means of verification: the techniques used to confirm adherence of the Project design to the established criteria or principles in M001. • Findings: any deviations from the established criteria or principles, or a lack of adequate evidence. • Conclusion: comprehensive assessment to determine if the project design's content is sufficiently accurate and complete to adhere to the specified criteria or principles.
Proposition	See the Validation Report, Section Findings (p8) for the detailed Propositions.

RP#14	
Revision Request	2.1 & 2.2
Document	M001
Section & Page	Section *Leakage*, page 27

Description	Allow the Project Developer to report leakage activity in the Project area by either specifying the percentage of displacement or directly indicating the displacement area.

Proposition	Replace 3.1 to 3.3 with:
	"Activity Mapping: Developers must identify the activities in the Project Area that will be displaced. More specifically, Developers must:
	• Run the Livelihoods community consultation and determine the activities that will be shifted
	• Determine the surface area of the activities that will be displaced using the Project Zonation feature on the ERS App.
	
	💡 Each Leakage Activity will be given an ID / name on the App, which will be used as a reference in the Mitigation Declaration Template.
	• Determine the displacement magnitude by
	  ○ Option 1: Disclosing the percentage of the activity that will be displaced during the crediting period in the ERS App, OR
	  ○ Option 2: Disclosing the precise area where the activity will be displaced using the ERS App
	• Provide details regarding the displacement of the activity, including the justification of the % of displacement.
	
	Mitigation. The Developer must define a leakage mitigation plan to:
	• Minimise the impact of the displaced activities and ensure, to the extent possible, equitable displacement to avoid only activities by more vulnerable community members being displaced.
	• Manage for the potential loss of the non-displaced activities"

RP#15	
Revision Request	2.3
Document	Quantification Methodology for Terrestrial Forest Restoration
Section & Page	Section I*nitial Leakage Quantification*, page 17
Description	Clarify the calculation for both leakage approaches.
Proposition	"To quantify leakage, ERS conservatively assumes that the total carbon stock in the Displacement Areas will be reduced to 0. If Option 1 has been chosen, the following calculation is applied: **L**id = **A**i x **P**i x **C**i Where: • **L**id = Estimated GHG emissions from a Leakage Activity i; tCO_2e. • **A**i = Land-surface of the activity i within the Project Area; ha. • **P**i = Declared % of displacement of the activity i; dimensionless. • **C**i = Mean carbon stock in the Leakage Belt; $tCO_2e \cdot ha^{-1}$ The mean carbon stock of the Leakage Belt is determined using sampling plots. If Option 2 has been chosen, the following calculation is applied:

	Lid = E**A**i x **C**i Where: • **L**id = Estimated GHG emissions from a Leakage Activity i; tCO2e. • E**A**i = Estimated Land-surface of the displaced activity i; ha. • **C**i = Carbon stock where the activity i will be located; tCO2e·ha–1. Total Leakage is calculated using the following equation: “ $$(13)\ \mathbf{L}^{d} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbf{L}_{i}^{d}$$

RP#16	
Revision Request	2.1
Document	M001
Section & Page	Section *Leakage Monitoring*, page 28
Description	Clarify the Leakage process between Year 0 and Year 4.
Proposition	Add “Monitoring from Year 0 to Year 4”: “Developers must report annually on the Leakage Mitigation interventions defined in the Social Additionality Plan. If the location or

	extent of the Activity Displacement Areas is modified, changes must be declared in the Project Annual Report. ERS monitors the Project Area and its Leakage Belt remotely through satellite imagery to track forest cover change and detect loss events. ERS uses integrated deforestation alerts from Global Forest Watch (GFW) to trigger alerts on changes in forest cover." Add "Reassessment of leakage at Y4": "Developer reassessment: The Developer must update the information on the activities that have been displaced. • Inform the area where the activities have been shifted using the ERS App. • Provide details regarding the reinstalment of the activity, including the justifications for the new area (size, location, activity description). To verify the information given by the Developer: • ERS uses satellite imagery to confirm if the Leakage Area(s) - location(s) and extent - matches the Developer's declaration. This includes comparing the historical deforestation rate of the Leakage Belt with the deforestation rate in the Y0-Y4 period. • ERS cross-checks the completion of the Leakage Mitigation Plan to ensure that activities have been displaced/compensated as stated at Y0. • The VVB verifies that deforestation in the Leakage Belt is not linked to Project activities."

RP#17

Revision Request	2.3
Document	Quantification Methodology for Terrestrial Forest Restoration
Section & Page	Section *Leakage Correction*, page 18
Description	Clarify the calculation for leakage correction at Y4.
Proposition	" Leakage correction: • Leakage is recalculated: $L_{i,t} = C_{i,t} - C_{i,t=0}$ Where: ○ **L**id = GHG emissions from a Leakage Activity i at year t; tCO2e. ○ **C**i,t = Carbon stock at year t where the activity i is located; tCO2e·ha−1."

RP#18	
Revision Request	2.1
Document	M001

Section & Page	Section *Leakage Monitoring*, page 28
Description	Clarify the leakage monitoring after Y4.
Proposition	Modify 3.5 and 3.6: "Monitoring after Year 4: Land cover is monitored annually within a five-kilometre-wide transitional or boundary zone along the Project's perimeter, called the Leakage Belt: • Significant Land cover changes in the Leakage Belt will be notified to the Developer. The Developer must then provide justification for ERS to determine whether the change is linked to the Project activities or not. If the justification is unsatisfactory, ERS reserves the right to send a VVB on the ground.

RP#19	
Revision Request	6.3
Document	Quantification Methodology for Terrestrial Forest Restoration
Section & Page	Section *Biomass Quantification of Woody and Non-Woody Areas*, page 8

Description	Use a region-specific root-to-shot ratio for calculating Below Ground Biomass (BGB).
Proposition	Modify 2.2 page 9: "The root-to-shoot ratios applied are based on the 2019 updated values from the IPCC. This organisation provides root-to-shoot (R:S) values for each ecological zone across continents (Asia, Africa, North and South America), distinguishing between above-ground biomass values less than and greater than 125 tDM/Ha. ERS uses values specific to natural origins, as detailed in Appendix" Modify 2.2 page 13: "The root-to-shoot ratios applied are based on the 2019 updated values from the IPCC. This organisation provides root-to-shoot (R:S) values for each ecological zone across continents (Asia, Africa, North and South America), distinguishing between above-ground biomass values less than and greater than 125 tDM/Ha. ERS uses values specific to natural origins, as detailed in Appendix". Add an Appendix with the values from IPCC: https://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp/public/2019rf/pdf/4_Volume4/19R_V4_Ch04_Forest%20Land.pdf

RP#20	
Revision Request	1.1 from SR002

Document	Quantification Methodology for Terrestrial Forest Restoration
Section & Page	Section *AGB Provider Benchmark*, page 32
Description	Add a backup AGB provider.
Proposition	Quantification Methodology: Add to the Conclusion paragraph: "In instances where Chloris Geospatial is unable to supply timely AGB maps for required areas, ERS has appointed Kanop as an alternative AGB provider to ensure continuous data availability."

RP#21	
Revision Request	6.1
Document	Quantification Methodology for Terrestrial Forest Restoration
Section & Page	Section *Dynamic Baseline*, page 20
Description	Exclude the leakage belt from the selection of control plots when processing the dynamic baseline.

Proposition	Add “and the leakage belt” in the text; section 1.3 Page 20: “Control plots that are outside of the Project Area **and the Leakage Belt** but that share similar ecological and bio-physical characteristics” Add “and outside the leakage belt” in 3; 3.1 Page 21: “Concept. Areas or sub-zones that share similar characteristics to the clusters, located outside of the Project site **and outside the Leakage Belt** and referred to as control plots, are identified using the K-Nearest Neighbors (KNN) algorithm.”

RP#22	
Revision Request	6.4
Document	Quantification Methodology for Terrestrial Forest Restoration
Section & Page	Pages 8 and 15
Description	Clarify how uncertainties are incorporated into the calculations.
Proposition	Add to Above Ground Biomass, section 2.1, page 8: “Uncertainty calculation for AGB: ERS computes the total error, factoring in the spatial autocorrelation

inherent in every measurement. This calculation is represented as:

$$SE_{total} = \sqrt{(1-r)\sum(SE_{pixel}^2) + r\left(\sum SE_{pixel}\right)^2}$$

Where:

SE_{total} = The total Standard Error

SE_{pixel} = The error associated with biomass measurement in each pixel.

r = correlation factor between pixels. By default, here r = 0.01.

The value of SE_{total} is then adjusted by a factor of 1.96 to establish a 95% confidence interval; as :

$$CI = SE_{total} * 1.96$$

Add an Uncertainty section to every calculation formula across the Methodology:

To compute the BGB uncertainty ERS uses the following formula :

$$\Delta BGB_{rest}^{n-w} = |BGB_{rest}^{n-w}|\sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{AGB_{rest}^{n-w}}\right)^2 * \Delta AGB_{rest}^{n-w^2} + \left(\frac{1}{RS^{n-w}}\right)^2 *$$

Where :

ΔBGB_{rest}^{n-w} = Non-woody BGB uncertainty at the Restoration Site; tDM

BGB_{rest}^{n-w} = Non-woody BGB at the Restoration Site; tDM

AGB_{rest}^{n-w} = Non-woody AGB at the Restoration Site; tDM

ΔAGB_{rest}^{n-w} = Non-woody AGB uncertainty at the Restoration Site; tDM

RS^{n-w} = Root-to-shoot ratio of non-woody biomass. dimensionless

ΔRS^{n-w} = Root-to-shoot ratio of non-woody biomass uncertainty. dimensionless

Modify section *Carbon Sequestration Potential of Restoration Sites* Paragraph 1.3, page 15:

	"To determine the carbon potential while adhering to a conservative methodology, ERS will augment the baseline value of the restoration site and its associated uncertainty. Simultaneously, it will reduce the baseline value of the reference ecosystem. This is expressed as: $C_{potential} = (A_{project} \times (\overline{C_{ref}} - \Delta\overline{C_{ref}})) - (C_{rest} + \Delta C_{rest})$ Where : $C_{potential}$ = Represents the Project's carbon sequestration potential; tCO2e. $A_{project}$ = Represent the size of the Restoration Site; ha. $\overline{C_{ref}}$ = Mean carbon stock on the Reference Site, represents the mean CO2 sequestrated; tCO2e · ha–1. $\Delta\overline{C_{ref}}$ = Mean carbon stock uncertainty on the Reference Site C_{rest} = Represents the initial carbon stock of the Restoration Sites; tCO2e ΔC_{rest} = Represents the initial carbon stock uncertainty of the Restoration Sites; tCO2e

RP#23	
Revision Request	4.1
Document	Standard Revision Procedure
Section & Page	Pages 4 to 6
Description	Improve the Standard Revision Procedure to make it more effective.

Proposition	Page 4, section *Submission Phase*: Remove the paragraph regarding standard revision requests, and replace it with: "Standard Revision Proposition. Based on the feedback collected from ERS Entities, the Secretariat may submit a Standard Revision Proposition to the TAB. The Proposition must exhaustively detail all the changes that should be implemented to the Standard and its affiliated documents. The Secretariat may draft the Propositions in collaboration with the Certification and R&D teams." Page 5, section *Review Phase*. Remove the paragraph regarding standard revision propositions (which was moved to the upper section) and replace it with: "Review. The TAB must answer Standard Revision Propositions within 30 consecutive days. If not, they shall be considered as rejected." Page 6, section *Public Comment Period*. Rephrase point 2.5.2: "The TAB must require a Public Comment Period if the Standard Revision Proposition: • Modifies existing methodology principles and methods, particularly documents regarding the qualification and quantification of GHG emission removals. • Creates a new methodology to certify a different type of project activity." Page 6, section *Public Comment Period*. Remove the following paragraph: "Governance. All documents regarding the internal rules and organisation of ERS, as well as its relation to Third Parties, especially regarding conflicts of interest, anti-corruption and anti-fraud."

RP#24

Revision Request	3.3
Document	Technical Advisory Board
Section & Page	Pages 5 to 8
Description	Improve the Technical Advisory Board procedures.

Proposition	Page 5, section *Composition of the Technical Advisory Group*, under "Group Members", add:
	• "Co-chairs. So as to facilitate TAB governance, two co-chairs are appointed by TAB members to:
	  ○ Organise discussion points and platforms between TAB members to review and propose standard revisions
	  ○ Take the lead in the mandate and organisation of working groups
	  ○ Take meeting notes when Secretariat Agents are not present
	  ○ Report back and coordinate with the Secretariat
	• Co-chairs equally share those tasks and can delegate their powers to each other in case of unavailability.
	• Co-chairs are appointed during the first TAB meeting of every calendar year."
	
	Page 7, section *Exclusion*. Add a sentence at the end of the section stating: "TAB members may also choose to terminate their involvement with ERS prior to the completion of their term, provided there is mutual consent with the Secretariat."
	
	Page 7, section *Working Groups.* Rephrase the sentence that says that TAB members cannot be part of a working group to "TAB members

[redacted]	can lead and/or participate in a Working Group where relevant. In that case, the ERS Secretariat or Directive will be in charge of deciding the appointment of TAB member's roles in the working groups". Page 8, section *Frequency*. • Modify the paragraph regarding monthly meetings to: "Quarterly Meetings: The Secretariat must present major advancements to TAB members, and when relevant, can discuss Standard Revisions together with TAB members." • In "ad-hoc meetings", remove the sentence "TAB members may schedule a maximum of one ad hoc meeting every month." Page 8, section *TAB decisions*. Add the following section: **"**TAB decisions. • Majority Vote. The TAB operates based on a majority voting system. • Online**.** The TAB may approve decisions online, during meetings, using live voting systems. ○ If a TAB member is unable to participate in the live decision-making process, they are required to delegate their voting authority to another TAB member. • Offline. The TAB may approve decisions asynchronously, using appropriate and secured voting platforms. • For both scenarios, the co-chairs are responsible for documenting the reasons behind TAB decisions using the appropriate templates, in line with the Standard Revision Procedure. • If a TAB member fails to submit their decision in the required timeframe, it can be considered as grounds for their exclusion. • The Secretariat cannot interfere with TAB decisions. As such, Secretariat agents must not be present during decision-making processes."

RP#25	
Revision Request	N/A
Document	Zonation Guidelines
Section & Page	Section *Feasibility*, page 3
Description	Adjust the Zonation process.

Proposition	Change Step 1 to "Project Area Assessment": ERS now requests Developers to do research to better understand the area using desktop data, engagement with stakeholders and field assessments.
	
	Add "The Developer must perform research to better understand the Project Area's history, land use, social occupation, administrative status, land cover, biome(s) and ecosystem(s). Information sources include:
	
	• Desktop-data:
	  ○ Ground-truthed maps from satellite imagery;
	  ○ Aerial photos;
	  ○ Maps of vegetation, soils, and topography that can provide an understanding of the landscape;
	  ○ Past Project reports.
	• Project's Stakeholders:
	  ○ Via documented Stakeholder engagement interactions;
	  ○ Via IPLCs interviews.

- Field assessment."

Add to Step 2: "If an area is to be excluded from restoration work, the Developer must clearly indicate them as an "exclusion zone" in the Project Shapefile."

Modify Step 3:

- "If IPLCs are part of the Project's Stakeholders, the Developer must follow FPIC Guidelines and present to IPLCs the Preliminary Zonation.
    - The IPLCs engagement must inform the "Participatory Mapping" tab in the Ecological Recovery Assessment.
    - The IPLCs engagement process must respect the guidelines described in item 1.2 of the Free, Prior and Informed Consent Guidelines. By the end of the process, the Developer must have completed the tab.
- Inputs must be incorporated so the Zonation represents IPLCs needs, approvals and aspirations. The Developer can then define the zonation's final design."

Add Step 4: "SHAPEFILE & FEASIBILITY STUDY REPORT":
"The Developer must submit in the ERS Web App a Project Shapefile. The shapefile can be imported or directly drawn in the ERS Web App and must contain:

- The Project Area;
- The Project's zonation.

Based on the Zonation process, the Developer must inform the following fields of the Feasibility Study Report:

- PROJECT STAKEHOLDERS & STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT > 3. Stakeholder Engagement Results (and all its sub-items).
- PROJECT SITES > 1. Restoration Site (and all its sub-items)."

RP#26	
Revision Request	7.2
Document	Programme
Section & Page	*Project Feasibility,* page 25
Description	Allow Projects to move forward to the next phase with contingencies.
Proposition	Add to 2.1.11: "If all information is cleared, the Project is qualified to advance to the Assessment phase of the certification. ERS may decide to initiate the Assessment phase of a Project if one or more Feasibility documents are missing, on the sole condition that the Developer is capable of providing said documents before the end of the Assessment. Documents eligible for this exception are: • Signed Contracts with landowners or rights holders, if the Developer can prove the contract is being negotiated. • Government authorisation letters, if the Developer can prove the letter was requested to the competent authorities. • Government attestations or certificates, if the Developer can prove the letter was requested to the competent authorities. • Signed Contracts with carbon rights holders, if the Developer can prove the contract is being negotiated. ○ Proofs of negotiation include but are not limited to email exchanges, signed MOUs, and receipt of

	authorisation request in case of government negotiations."

RP#27	
Revision Request	8
Document	Programme
Section & Page	*Grievance Mechanism*, Page 10
Description	Reinforce the grievance mechanism.
Proposition	Modify the 1.8 Reviewers section, Page 12: "Reviewers. All grievance claims are reviewed by the ERS Secretariat. To ensure impartiality: • In the event of a grievance claimed against an ERS Secretariat Agent, the implicated Agent is excluded from participating in its resolution. • In cases where the entire Secretariat team is suspected of wrongdoing, or if the claim relates to fraudulent Registry operations, ERS must engage a third-party auditor to investigate the claim. • In the event of suspicious activity grievances, the Director of the Secretariat is responsible for addressing the claim. ○ If the suspicious activity is reported against ERS or any

	of its affiliated Agents, a third-party auditor must be engaged to investigate the claim. Third Party Mandate. In cases where a Third Party is mandated, the Director of the Secretariat has twenty business days from the day they receive the claim to contract the service. After contracting, the Third Party must report directly and exclusively to the Fiduciary Board." Add to Investigations, Section 3.1 Methods, page 13: "When the investigation is carried out by a Third Party auditor, they are responsible for determining the methods to be applied. ERS can not contest it."

RP#28	
Revision Request	3 from SR002
Document	Risk Assessment Matrix
Section & Page	N/A - see details below
Description	Adjust the Risk Assessment Matrix based on the feedback from the first certifications.
Proposition	Disclaimer: all nº and lines refer to the V1.0 document. • Nº 3.3 (line 75) "Country or region has weak political institutions" - change from "ERS Requirement and reversal risk"

[redacted]	to "ERS requirement and Delivery risk". • Nº 3.5 (line 77) "Project's jurisdiction doesn't have a solid independence of courts" - Remove this risk and leave only risk 3.3 "Country or region has weak political institutions". *Justification: the methodology for assessment is the same as for risk 3.3 and independence of the legal system is a part of the strength of political institutions*. • Nº 3.6 (line 78) "Host country or project's region has a high level of corruption" - change this risk from "Reversal" to "ERS Requirement and Delivery"; change the methodology for assessment: use the World Bank data that provides a ranking-based evaluation of countries. • Nº 3.7 (line 79) "Host country has no agreement with ERS' country" - add the link https://www.diplomatie.gouv.fr/fr/dossiers-pays/ to the Analysis and Methodology (French Government website) • Nº 3.9 (line 81) "Future Environmental laws are a threat to the project" - change from "Delivery & reversal" to a "Blocker" risk: the Project must comply with local legislation. For the Assessment method, change to: "Question in the Feasibility Study and Safeguards declaration". • Nº 5.2.3. & 5.2.4 (lines 93 & 94) "Project doesn't have a legally binding contract with those holding land tenure or rights for a 100 year period from Project start date" & "Project doesn't have a legally binding contract with those holding carbon rights for a 100 year period from Project start date" - Remove these risks. *Justification: Evaluating risk based on a 100-year period is not consistent with ERS' requirements (40 years contract). As a consequence, it will increase the risk of the majority of the projects without the request to establish longer contracts.* • Nº 5.3.1. (line 97) "Project results in market leakage" - Remove this risk. *Justification: ERS does not cover Market leakage in this version of the Methodology.* • Nº 6.1 (line 105) "Due to natural disaster" - add national data sources to "analysis and methodology".

[redacted]	• Nº 6.1.6 (line 111) "Drought" - change of the IPCC related link in the analysis and methodology. • Nº 6.1.9-6.1.10 (lines 114 and 115) "Heavy rains" and "Extreme temperatures" - Change assessment to country/region specific data. • Nº 7.6 (line 125) "The number of species planted is the minimum required by the Standard" - Remove this risk. *Justification: It is not a standard requirement anymore.* • Nº 7.8 (line 127) "Current and future extreme weather risk was not considered in the restoration plan" - Just leave "restoration plan" in the methodology. • Nº 8.2 (line 130) "Lack of traditional local experts" - Remove this risk. *Justification: The previous risk is too similar.* • Nº 8.3 (line 131) "Undesired hybridization and spread of new invasive species" - Update the document's name in the methodology to "Ecological Recovery Assessment & Validation Audit". • Nº 8.5 (line 133) "Presence of dangerous wildlife" - Update the document's name in the methodology to "Ecological Recovery Assessment & Validation Audit". • Nº 10.1 (line 141) "There are previous grievances or social conflicts in the Community (as related per interviewed stakeholders)" - Change the risk name to "There are previous grievances or social conflicts in the Community" and change methodology to 'Livelihoods matrix'." • Nº10.2 (line 142) "Lack of mechanisms for vulnerable groups' participation" - Change methodology from "Community consultation guidelines then audit" to "Stakeholder mapping, Social Additionality Plan and community consultation". • Nº10.5 (line 150) "Draft and final benefit-sharing plan are shared with the affected IPs & LCs in a form, manner, and language that is not understandable to them" - Change the methodology from "Community Consultation guidelines then audit" to "Benefit sharing mechanism, community consultation and Social Additionality Plan"

	• N°12.1 (line 156) "Project's team is not from local community" - change the methodology from "Verification of Livelihood Matrix then audit" to "Feasibility study report & audit".

RP#29	
Revision Request	1.2
Document	Due Diligence Report - Template
Section & Page	N/A, see details below
Description	Establish an independent due diligence procedure tailored for project developers, taking into account the variety of organisations that can assume this role and evaluating their ability to successfully implement the Project on-site.
Proposition	Modify the "Due Diligence Report" template to incorporate the following changes: • Remove SCOPE: merge the text in the SUMMARY section. • Remove GUIDING PRINCIPLES: the Anti-Fraud Policy already covers most requirements. • Remove the table "Third Party Screening and Due Diligence Processes". • Move third-party identification to the very top with modifications to the table:

	○ Add if this is a Developer, VVB or other ○ remove “Turnover” to another table ○ Remove ISIC Code ○ Remove “Homonymy” ○ Add “Countries of operation” ○ Add “Main legal representative” ● Add a section “Partnerships” to describe banking, commercial partnerships and involvement in prohibited industry. ● Ask for at least 2 “Executive Members” instead of 3. ● Modifications to the Moral Person shareholder table. ● Add a Capacity section to list collaborators. ● Add an experience section to list past project experiences. ● Add questions to the Legal status and reputation section. ● Simplify the Compliance section. ● Remove the Financials section. ● Move the report summary to the end to identify who the template is addressed to before summarising the results.

RP#30	
Revision Request	5.2
Document	Programme
Section & Page	N/A, see details below
Description	Add a detailed procedure outlining the steps to be followed when projects are halted.

Proposition	Add page 48, before Project Failure: "Project Halting. Concept**:** A project is considered halted when its crediting capacity is momentarily stopped by ERS due to non-conformity with one or more requirements or procedures of the ERS Programme or the M001 Methodology for Terrestrial Forest Restoration, without resulting in permanent incapacity to carry out activities. Conditions**:** Additionally to other conditions forecasted in the Programme and in the M001 Methodology for Terrestrial Forest Restoration, ERS considers the following as grounds for halting a Project: • Incapacity to provide ERS with required MRV documents within sixty (60) days past the deadline or request date without prior agreement from ERS. • Incapacity to provide ERS with a plan to comply with methodological or programme updates within one hundred and eighty (180) days after update notification and to be fully compliant within the Verification audit following an update. • The Project is undergoing investigation resulting from a grievance complaint filed against it. Refer to the *ERS Grievance Mechanism* section for more details. • Exceed the fifteen-days grace period accorded by ERS to proceed with Fees payment. Notification: ERS' Certification Agents will notify the Developer of the risk of the Project being halted, by email, thirty (30) days before the deadline. Once the Project is considered halted, the Certification Agent will notify the Developer within twenty-four (24) hours. Delays: A Project can be halted for a hundred and eighty (180) consecutive days, after which it will be considered as an "avoidable failure". Exceptions to the duration of a halting status can be made

	when: • Halting occurs due to ERS' inaccessibility to satellite data. In this case, the Project will remain halted until access is regained. • Halting occurs due to grievance. In this case, the Project will remain halted until a grievance resolution is published. • Natural disasters, civil unrest or other macro circumstances out of the Developer's control. Halted Projects Monitoring: Halted Projects continue to be monitored by ERS for reversals. Unless explicitly requested by an ERS Certification Agent via email, Developers must continue ongoing monitoring and reporting as specified in the *MRV Procedures* section in the chosen methodology documentation. Fee payment: The Developer must continue to pay ERS the MRV fees regardless of the Project's halted status. Conclusion: Reached the determined delay, a halted Project: • Can resume activities if it satisfies the condition(s) that originated the temporary stop. • Will be considered failed if it does not satisfy the conditions that originated the temporary stop."

RP#31	
Revision Request	N/A
Document	M001

Section & Page	Eligibility criteria, section Project Scope, page 6
Description	T4 ecosystems are known to sequester less carbon compared to T1 and T2 ecosystems, which initially led to the exclusion of T4 from the Project Scope. Nevertheless, due to a significant increase in requests for certifying ecosystem restoration projects, particularly in T4.1 and T4.4 ecosystems, ERS is now extending its focus to include T4 ecosystems. Additionally, Chloris, our Above Ground Biomass (AGB) provider, has the capability to map AGB in these ecosystems. Currently, they are providing us with a detailed report that focuses on the calibration of their model for "drylands" ecosystems. As soon as this report is completed, it will be forwarded to the Technical Advisory Board (TAB).
Proposition	Modify Project Scope: “The Project must be located in ‘Tropical-subtropical forests’ (T1), ‘Temperate-boreal forests’ (T2), ‘Trophic savannas’ (T4.1), ‘Pyric tussock savannas’ (T4.2), ‘Hummock savannas’ (T4.3) or ‘Temperate woodlands’ (T4.4) biomes following the IUCN classification.

PROVISIONAL TIMELINE

Target deadline for TAB response (30 days) : 02/04/2024

EXPECTED RISKS

List and describe the expected risks associated with the Standard Revision Request.

No risks have been identified by the Secretariat.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

Does the Secretariat consider that this Standard Revision Request requires a Public Comment Period?

- ☐ Yes
- ☑ No

If yes, please describe the scope of the expected Public Comment Period.

N/A

Revision request SR001 and SR002 - TAB feedback and approval

Date	Response type	TAB revision request - SR001Do you have any positive comments and...	TAB revision request - SR001Do you have any negative comments and...	SR001 - TAB approval	SR001 - TAB rejection	TAB revision request - SR002Do you have any positive comments and...	TAB revision request - SR002Do you have any negative comments and...	SR002 - TAB approval	SR002 - TAB rejection
22 Mar 2024 19:57	Completed	I congratulate the Secretariat to put a revision request in record time to align with CORSIA requirements.	Beyond the CORSIA requirements, I'd suggest we first short-list where do we want to take the standard and align with as many platforms as we can. This way we save time.	Nathalie Flores	No	Overall is fine.	Not a negative comment, but a consideration to take into account data use for the WB FCPF and the UNFCCC reference levels.	Yes	No
20 Mar 2024 18:44	Completed	–	–	Amy Bann	–	–	–	Amy Bann	–
19 Mar 2024 22:10	Completed	–	–	Yes	No	–	–	Yes	No
19 Mar 2024 18:26	Completed	–	–	Eduard Müller	–	–	–	Eduard Müller	–
19 Mar 2024 18:25	Completed	Robin	No	Robin Cole	–	Very pragmatic and valuable refinements	None	Robin Cole	–
19 Mar 2024 18:32	Completed	All the revision-request items seem relevant and make sense to be implemented. There might be some fine-tuning of certain formulations and their interrelation to other items, but I would assume that this is rather work in progress	–	Fidel Chiriboga	–	All the revision-request items seem relevant and make sense to be implemented. There might be some fine-tuning of certain formulations and their interrelation to other items, but I would assume that this is rather work in progress	–	Fidel Chiriboga	–

Ecosystem Restoration Standard

TAB Standard Revision Proposition RP001

6 responses

RP#1

6 out of 6 answered

Accept	6 resp.	100%
Other (please formulate in the following window)	0 resp.	0%
Reject	0 resp.	0%

RP#2

6 out of 6 answered

Accept	6 resp.	100%
Other (please formulate in the following window)	0 resp.	0%

Reject 0 resp. 0%

RP#3

6 out of 6 answered

Accept 6 resp. 100%

Other (please formulate in the following window) 0 resp. 0%

Reject 0 resp. 0%

RP#4

6 out of 6 answered

Accept 6 resp. 100%

Other (please formulate in the following window) 0 resp. 0%

Reject 0 resp. 0%

RP#5

6 out of 6 answered

Accept 6 resp. 100%

Other (please formulate in the following window) 0 resp. 0%

Reject 0 resp. 0%

RP#6

6 out of 6 answered

Accept 6 resp. 100%

Other (please formulate in the following window) 0 resp. 0%

Reject 0 resp. 0%

RP#7

6 out of 6 answered

Accept 5 resp. 83.3%

Other (please formulate in the following window) 1 resp. 16.7%

Reject 0 resp. 0%

RP#8

6 out of 6 answered

Accept 6 resp. 100%

Other (please formulate in the following window) 0 resp. 0%

Reject 0 resp. 0%

RP#9

6 out of 6 answered

Accept 6 resp. 100%

Other (please formulate in the following window) 0 resp. 0%

Reject 0 resp. 0%

RP#10

6 out of 6 answered

Accept 5 resp. 83.3%

Other (please formulate in the following window) 1 resp. 16.7%

Reject 0 resp. 0%

RP#11

6 out of 6 answered

Accept 6 resp. 100%

Other (please formulate in the following window) 0 resp. 0%

Reject 0 resp. 0%

RP#12

6 out of 6 answered

Accept 5 resp. 83.3%

Other (please formulate in the following window) 1 resp. 16.7%

Reject 0 resp. 0%

RP#13

6 out of 6 answered

Accept 5 resp. 83.3%

Other (please formulate in the following window) 1 resp. 16.7%

Reject 0 resp. 0%

RP#14

6 out of 6 answered

Accept 6 resp. 100%

Other (please formulate in the following window) 0 resp. 0%

Reject 0 resp. 0%

RP#15

6 out of 6 answered

Accept 6 resp. 100%

Other (please formulate in the following window) 0 resp. 0%

Reject 0 resp. 0%

RP#16

5 out of 6 answered

Accept 5 resp. 100%

Other (please formulate in the following window) 0 resp. 0%

Reject 0 resp. 0%

RP#17

6 out of 6 answered

Accept 6 resp. 100%

Other (please formulate in the following window) 0 resp. 0%

Reject 0 resp. 0%

RP#18

6 out of 6 answered

Accept 6 resp. 100%

Other (please formulate in the following window) 0 resp. 0%

Reject 0 resp. 0%

RP#19

6 out of 6 answered

Accept 6 resp. 100%

Other (please formulate in the following window) 0 resp. 0%

Reject 0 resp. 0%

RP#20

6 out of 6 answered

Accept 6 resp. 100%

Other (please formulate in the following window) 0 resp. 0%

Reject 0 resp. 0%

RP#21

6 out of 6 answered

Accept 6 resp. 100%

Other (please formulate in the following window) 0 resp. 0%

Reject 0 resp. 0%

RP#22

6 out of 6 answered

Accept 6 resp. 100%

Other (please formulate in the following window) 0 resp. 0%

Reject 0 resp. 0%

RP#23

6 out of 6 answered

Accept 5 resp. 83.3%

Other (please formulate in the following window) 1 resp. 16.7%

Reject 0 resp. 0%

RP#24

6 out of 6 answered

Accept 5 resp. 83.3%

Other (please formulate in the following window) 1 resp. 16.7%

Reject 0 resp. 0%

RP#25

6 out of 6 answered

Accept 6 resp. 100%

Other (please formulate in the following window) 0 resp. 0%

Reject 0 resp. 0%

RP#26

6 out of 6 answered

Accept 6 resp. 100%

Other (please formulate in the following window) 0 resp. 0%

Reject 0 resp. 0%

RP#27

6 out of 6 answered

Accept 6 resp. 100%

Other (please formulate in the following window) 0 resp. 0%

Reject 0 resp. 0%

RP#28

6 out of 6 answered

Accept 6 resp. 100%

Other (please formulate in the following window) 0 resp. 0%

Reject 0 resp. 0%

RP#29

6 out of 6 answered

Accept 6 resp. 100%

Other (please formulate in the following window) 0 resp. 0%

Reject 0 resp. 0%

RP#30

6 out of 6 answered

Accept 6 resp. 100%

Other (please formulate in the following window) 0 resp. 0%

Reject 0 resp. 0%

RP#31

6 out of 6 answered

Accept 6 resp. 100%

Other (please formulate in the following window) 0 resp. 0%

Reject 0 resp. 0%

Powered by Typeform

Nathalie Flores

DocuSigned by:
Nathalie Flores
C512B462D7F84AB...

Eduard Müller

DocuSigned by:
Eduard Müller
8CABEE62A89D48B...

Sara Loefqvis

DocuSigned by:
Sara Loefqvis
A2FC7106305F4B7...

Fidel Chiriboga

DocuSigned by:
8C07E2C35DE74F2...

Robin Cole

DocuSigned by:
Robin Cole
CF590C640C4C4D2...

Amy Bann

DocuSigned by:
Amy Bann
061C6070177C445...

Priscille Raynaud

DocuSigned by:
Priscille Raynaud
93E582B61DA64B6...