

Input by:

Louis Uzor
Climate Policy Manager
Climeworks AG
M louis.uzor@climeworks.com

Date:

2023/05/25

Input to SB005 annotated agenda and related annexes

Dear members of the Article 6.4 Supervisory Body, dear Secretariat

Climeworks appreciates the opportunity to provide input to the fifth meeting of the A6.4SB, though highlighting that the period for commenting was very short. We generally encourage the Supervisory Body to strive for simple processes that allow a broader participation towards calls for input.

Much of the input we feel necessary to express is reflected in submissions to this call by the Negative Emission Platform (NEP), the Direct Air Capture Coalition (DACCC) or co-signatures of the Carbon Removal Alliance (CRA) to which Climeworks is a member. Therefore, the below is focusing on (additional) points we deem most important to the further success of the Article 6.4 mechanism with regards to carbon dioxide removal methods.

1) Information note: Removal activities under the Article 6.4 mechanism

Climeworks strongly encourages a more balanced representation of inputs received in earlier consultation and a significant improvement towards better reflections of the scientific assessments of carbon dioxide removals presented e.g. within the IPCC's AR6.

We agree with notion of trade-offs between economic and climate considerations when presenting CDR to economic markets. However, we see the current discussions highly concerning regarding features such as the choice of a time period and an additional discount factor, that we believe to be at odds with Decision 3/CMA.3, specifying that reversals shall be addressed "in full". Nevertheless, we welcome the fact that removals are discussed as a separated instance, allowing for much needed discussions and decisions on presumed "trade-offs" between durability, costs and near term-potentials. Climeworks firmly believes in a need of a portfolio of CDR methods and welcomes further work allowing for a contribution by several CDR methods, each based on a robust assessments and transparent reflections of climate benefits. One option not considered to the extent possible remains the introduction of distinct CDR mitigation outcomes, reflecting the storage durability of the chosen CDR method in a transparent manner. The European CRC-F framework presents a framework that is strives for this outcome. Besides these critical aspects of differentiation between CDR methods, a clear separation between reductions and removals generally allows for more clarity on the role, foreseen share and timing of CDR and could be reflected via distinct mitigation outcomes. The IPCC stresses that CDR must come "**in addition** to deep, rapid, and sustained emission reductions" for it to "fulfill the three **complementary roles**". Mechanisms to avoid a conflating between mitigation from emission reductions and CDR should be further discussed.

2) Information note: Workplan of the Supervisory Body 2023

Climeworks acknowledges and welcomes the ambition presented in the Workplan of the Supervisory Body 2023. However, given the long term impacts of the framework under development, there is little (if any) room for a "false start". The quantification of CDR



methods in line with climate science makes for a novelty with corresponding complexities. For a meaningful contribution of all CDR methods towards the temperature targets specified under the Paris Climate accord, Climeworks encourages quality, robustness and transparency over speed.

Thank you for your efforts to help fight global warming.

Kind Regards,

Louis Uzor
Climate Policy Manager

Climeworks AG