Call for public input	A6.4-MEP004-A03: Draft Standard: Addressing leakage in mechanism methodologies (v. 01.0)

Name of submitter: Annette Cowie

Affiliated organization of the submitter (if any):

Contact email of submitter: annette.cowie@dpi.nsw.gov.au

Date: 3/3/2025

Legend for Columns

1 = Section Number in the document
2= Paragraph number
3 = Comment – the actual feedback or observation, including justification for what needs changing
4 = Proposed change – suggest the text if possible

A6.4-MEP004-A03 (v.01.0)			
1	**2**	**3**	**4**
Section no.	**Para. no.**	**Comment**	**Proposed change** (Include proposed text)
General		The draft standard is generally appropriate – I agree with the requirements and procedures to address leakage	
2	**3a, 3b**	I support conceptually; wording could be tidier	
2	**3c**	Support, but delete "frequently", which reduces clarity	Delete "frequently"
3	**Heading**	Applicability could be more clearly worded	Substitute Applicability with application
4	**7**	I support inclusion of positive leakage	
4	**8**	I support inclusion of international leakage	
4	**4**	I agree with the focus on level of service as the measure of leakage risk	
4	**9a And elsewhere**	"Applicability conditions" is hard to follow. Maybe "conditions of application" or "eligibility"	Replace "Applicability conditions" with "conditions of application" or "eligibility"
5.1	**12b**	Competing resources is hard to follow. Suggest reword as Competition for resource use	Substitute Use of competing resources with Competition for resource use also in 14b
Box 1	**Heading**	Use leakage in singular	Substitute leakages with leakage
5.2; 5.3	**14d; 21**	Examples should be separate from requirements text.	Reword to express as a requirement, not "for example". If this is purely and example, make it a subordinate sentence to the relevant requirement..
Appendix 1	**general**	The expression "sources, sinks and reservoirs", used multiple times, is a confusing switch in language, and departure from terminology commonly used in existing guidance associated with UNFCCC reporting and accounting. Sources and sinks can align with emissions and removals, and it is better to use those terms. It is not necessary to separately consider "reservoirs" - if the C stock in a reservoir is constant, there is no emission or removal; if it is increasing or decreasing, that will be captured as a removal or emission, respectively.	Replace sources, sinks and reservoirs throughout, with emissions, removals and emissions reduction, as applicable.