

CDR Application: Science Review 1

Project Name:

Reviewer Name:

Criteria Questions

Criteria 1, Physical footprint: Project takes advantage of carbon sinks less constrained by arable land

1. **How confident are you in this project's claims with respect to this criteria?**

(1 = Not confident, 4 = Very confident, N/A=Not enough info or not sure)

2. **Why did you select the rating that you did?**

(Consider and discuss the project's strengths and weaknesses with respect to this criteria. At scale, would this project require land critical for our food system?)

Criteria 2, Capacity: Project has a path to being a meaningful part of the carbon removal solution portfolio (>0.5Gt CO₂/yr by 2040)

Today's capacity

3. **In the "Offer to Stripe" section of the General Application, how realistic is the project's offered capacity?**

(1 = They underestimated, 4 = They overestimated, N/A=Not enough info or not sure)

4. **How likely is it that the project will deliver this capacity in the timeframe they offer?**

(1 = Very unlikely, 4 = Very likely, N/A=Not enough info or not sure)

Long-term potential for capacity

5. **How confident are you in this project's fundamental potential to scale to meet this criteria?**

(1 = Not confident, 4 = Very confident, N/A=Not enough info or not sure)

6. **Why did you select the rating that you did?**

(Consider and discuss the project's strengths and weaknesses with respect to this criteria)

Criteria 3, Cost: Project has a path to being affordable at scale (<\$100/ton by 2040)

7. **How confident are you in this project's claims with respect to this criteria?**

(1 = Not confident, 4 = Very confident, N/A=Not enough info or not sure)

8. **Why did you select the rating that you did?**

(Consider and discuss the project's strengths and weaknesses with respect to this criteria, e.g., Is the estimated current system cost and foundational assumptions believable? Are the techno-economics sound? Is it reasonable to expect the cost to decline as the project projects?)

Criteria 4, Durability: Project stores carbon permanently (>1,000 years)

9. How confident are you in this project's claims with respect to this criteria?

(1 = Not confident, 4 = Very confident, N/A=Not enough info or not sure)

10. Why did you select the rating that you did?

(Consider and discuss the project's strengths and weaknesses with respect to this criteria)

Criteria 5, Verifiability: Project uses scientifically rigorous and transparent methods for monitoring and verification

11. How robust is the current monitoring and verification protocol for this technology, broadly?

(1 = No accepted standard, high field uncertainty 4 = Rigorous, accepted standard, N/A=Not enough info or not sure)

12. How confident are you in this specific project's claims with respect to this criteria?

(1 = Not confident, 4 = Very confident, N/A=Not enough info or not sure)

13. Why did you select the rating that you did?

(Consider and discuss the project's strengths and weaknesses with respect to this criteria)

Criteria 6, Additionality: Project results in net new carbon being removed rather than taking credit for removal that would have occurred regardless

14. How confident are you in this project's claims with respect to this criteria?

(1 = Not confident, 4 = Very confident, N/A=Not enough info or not sure)

15. Why did you select the rating that you did?

(Consider and discuss the project's strengths and weaknesses with respect to this criteria)

Criteria 8, Net-negative lifecycle: Project results in a net reduction in atmospheric CO₂

16. How confident are you in this project's claims with respect to this criteria?

(1 = Not confident, 4 = Very confident, N/A=Not enough info or not sure)

17. Why did you select the rating that you did?

(Consider and discuss the project's strengths and weaknesses with respect to this criteria: is the LCA sound, with a reasonable LCA boundary? Are there unaccounted for byproducts? etc.)

Holistic Questions

18. If this project is within a removal pathway that we have purchased from previously, what compelling, differentiated innovation does this project bring?

(For example: does this enhanced weathering technology propose a more effective MRV? Does this DAC have better sorbent performance or more competitive carbonation rates?, etc.)

19. Would you recommend we purchase from this project?

("Yes", "no", "maybe")

Please explain your answer.

(As a reminder, Stripe takes full responsibility for final purchase decisions, your feedback serves to inform us and help us figure out how to act in the best interests of the field.)

20. Please describe the impact that Stripe purchasing from this project would have on the carbon removal field as a whole.

(For example: it would accelerate technology development, it would help answer a fundamental question, etc.)

21. If you answered “Yes” or “Maybe” above, what technical milestones would you consider putting in place to increase the likelihood of affordable removal at scale?

(As a reminder, Stripe looks to establish renewal criteria in project contracts that detail specific technical, operational and governance risks we would like to see the project address throughout their deployment)

22. Please list any questions you would like surfaced in team interviews

23. Are there any elements of this project where you have open questions or do not feel equipped to provide perspective?

(This helps us make sure that across reviewers, we have the breadth and depth of expertise that builds a holistic perspective.)

24. Bonus question: what is one improvement to either the technology or the project / team that would have enhanced the proposal?

25. Would you be comfortable with us sharing the non-confidential questions of this review verbatim with the project?

("Yes", "no")

26. If you answered “No” above, is there any feedback you’d like to provide that we can share verbatim with the project to help them improve?

--