Baseline standard

Para / issue/ option	Discussion/ comments	Guidance by the SBM
Whitelists/ blacklists (para 22ff)	- Any such list should be decided by the host Party and approved by the SBM; - Establishing such lists is not feasible (e.g. need for constant updating) /not acceptable / may be questioned by CMA; - Third party / other sources cannot be the basis of such lists for an intergovernmental mechanism; - Reference to GST is out of place / unacceptable / discriminatory to activity type - Whitelist options are not mutually exclusive and a combination could be a way forward; - Such lists may not be appropriate for all regions; - Preference for A.1 (iii); - See merit in lists as a procedural element/ approach; - Risk of lists being discriminatory in terms of mitigation options; - Perhaps a cross-cutting issue with lock-in (in additionality standard);	
Downward adjustment for alignment with temperature goal (para 28ff)	- Temperature goal exists in a specific context, global or national; how to quantify at activity level is not evident (issue of differentiation, equity, responsibility, etc.) - thus SBM cannot go with it; - Alignment to temperature goal is beyond all technical capabilities; we are limited to guessing; only the CMA can say what it is about; - Option B.3: as long as we have a downward adjustment which provides ambition over time and ensures below BAU we are showing alignment with the Paris Agreement; - Preference is for option B.3, alignment is not a given, need to mention it; - More work to be done on this.	
BAT	- There should be more guidance on what BAT is and host countries may need to be consulted; - Three usual options for setting BAT: at level of (i) methodology, (ii) project proponent; (iii) SBM (to ultimately decide/approve).	
Level of aggregation at which baseline approaches are applied	*Not discussed yet*	*Expected: clarify whether allowing to choose the baseline setting from any of the three levels proposed is fine.*
Need for mechanism methodologies to be revised regularly	*Not discussed yet*	*Expected: articulate SBM views on the matter.*

Consideration of legal requirements, policies and targets in determining BAU	*Not discussed yet*	*Expected: clarify whether elements from NDCs should be considered in paragraph 59 of the draft standard.*
General	- Applicability of the draft standard to removals (technology-based and nature-based) needs to be checked;	
Process related: Need for public inputs	- Public inputs in the midst of process, where we are not clear, does not help; - Public inputs: is part of our agreed process, can be useful; - Public inputs can delay, but can be useful; inclusion is ok.	
	-	

Process related: Others	- The document was made available only last week; There is therefore an issue on its availability for public comments (as part of the annotated agenda);
	- The document (or parts of it) needs more work;
	- The document is still overly complex (even with the graphs) – it is nowhere clarified that downwards adjustment only happens once;
	- It would have been helpful to have another presentation (besides the one delivered on the options) to understand how the baseline setting works;
	- The presentation was felt to be to "bare bones"/ issues only while it should have covered the full substance of the document;
	- It would be helpful if webcasts could be structured/located by agenda item;
	- There is a need to understand transparently the MEP process:
	    o Which options were considered
	    o On which item it reached a conclusion and made a choice (and how)
	    o On which item it is asking for guidance
	- An intersessional meeting with the MEP could potentially be organised, to discuss (i) what they worked on, how they approached the work, how they came to decisions in a balanced manner, etc.	