

Summary notes US Forest Technical Working Group #1

What are some recommendations do you have for of practices or approaches that have worked well (or not worked well) in similar working groups?

- Ecology should consider a conflict of interest/material financial interest disclosure for working group members regarding the topics discussed in the group
- Ecology should consider forming sub-committees on specific topics to meet outside of the monthly cadence
- Ecology should poll working group members on issues discussed
- Where possible, Ecology should provide a case study or example to explain the rationale for a considered revision
- Ecology should provide meeting materials – slides, agendas in advance of each meeting give panelists adequate time to review ahead of each meeting

What potential topics are missing from this list?

- Revisions to the leakage deductions in the protocol should be considered, some methodologies in the voluntary market use a higher rate of leakage deductions
 - Recent published literature was highlighted that identifies leakage rates that differ from those estimated in CARB's protocol
 - Leakage rates may be different for avoided emissions than for removals, both of which are component of forest offset projects.
- Ecology should consider alternative treatments of reversals, such as the 5 year monitoring report in ACR's protocol, rather than 1 year monitoring in the existing protocol to allow for more flexibility in forest management
- Ecology should review and consider Verra's standard for long term average requirements which seeks to ensure that only long term changes in forest carbon storage are captured and not fluxes.
- Ecology should consider ways to reduce MRV costs for small landowners, such as scaled approaches to MRV requirements
- Ecology should consider revisions to initial crediting approach for IFM projects, similar to the approach for avoided conversion projects
- The timing for assessment of involuntary reversals should be considered, and whether reforestation activities can mitigate the amount of credits reversed
- Ecology should consider allowing developers to apply an Ecology certified offset as a contribution to the buffer pool, rather than the existing approach of automatically placing a portion of forest offsets in the buffer pool
- Ecology should review how salvage harvesting and use in wood products may be deducted in involuntarily reversed carbon quantification
- Avoided conversion projects rely on land appraisal value, and Ecology should consider alternatives that mitigate the reliance on a single appraiser
- Ecology should allow for project boundary modifications to change over time
- Ecology should consider explicitly allowing merging of projects into a single project

- Credibility is key – any revisions should make the program more credible
- Ecology should review and consider revisions to supersections and assessment areas
- Ecology should consider the definition of logical management units to ensure that this definition does not allow for selective enrollment in the carbon market

In addition to comparable protocols, CARB Offset Taskforce report, and public comment, what resources should Ecology look to for potential offset protocol refinements?

- ICVCM report on IFM protocol review is forthcoming but may not be public within the timeframe of this rulemaking

What additional criteria should Ecology ask working group members to comment on through these discussions?

- Credibility and public perception
- Scale of potential changes – how changes may impact potential supply of projects
- Feasibility of implementation of these changes

What context information would be helpful for Ecology to provide to guide the discussion on each topic?

- Ecology should bring relevant critiques of protocol revisions to the discussion
- Scale of issue, if it is arising due to a failure to implement or if it's anticipated issue
- State and regional context, including statutory context and relevant sideboards