

March 24 Mediator Notes – Discussion on “Real” Design Principle

Discussion on Section II, 3a. “Real”:

- (1) The sentence containing *“there needs to be an established mechanism such that the market values of different offset types are commensurate with their capacity to store carbon”* could imply a very complex system. For the system to be effective, it must be credible and as simple as possible.
- (2) It was brought up that “real” can mean whether or not an activity can be observed, quantified, monitored, or reversed. Consider these for our definition.
- (3) The question was raised on how can “real” be identified or measured at the project scale and provide reasonable certainty that landscape scale goals will be achieved. The cumulative effect of the projects will not necessarily result in landscape goals being achieved. What advice can we provide? This also came up during the discussion on additional. The group appeared to be in agreement that we should consider adding a “landscape context” topic to the principles document. The topic likely is applicable to numerous design elements.
- (4) The sentence containing *“to a given standard of precision and accuracy”* raised concerns about creating a measurement system that could demand levels of precision & accuracy that would be overly cumbersome to potential users. We should encourage simplicity and cost effectiveness in measuring and monitoring to encourage broad landowner participation. The system must balance precision and accuracy with practicality.
- (5) The set of protocols should recognize the variability in certainty associated with different projects.

A straw poll was taken and the group agreed to ask the drafting subcommittee to incorporate these ideas into the language in this section of the Principles document. This will then be reviewed at a later date