

## Mark Uhart

*Webinar Chat Input* - The mitigation should include in-state, out-of-state (which includes out-of-country) for on-site, upstream and downstream GHG emissions. All types of emissions should be considered. Upstream GHG emissions should include the most recent science concerning monitoring and measuring tools.

*Webinar Chat Input* - There must be effective governance in place for tracking and verifying emissions. Governance includes the governing (authority, standards, policies, procedures), risk management and methods of compliance. Methods of compliance is where governance usually fails.

*Webinar Chat Input* - I don't think biomass energy projects should be allowed as a means of mitigation, nor any mitigation project that doesn't immediately result in a net reduction in GHGs. I would assume there are international safeguards to ensure a mitigation project is not applied against multiple project plans, when the GHGs from the sum of the projects exceeds the GHG reductions associated with the mitigation project.

Webinar Chat Input - I also believe there should be any allowance for fossil fuel GHG displacement options, that a "cleaner" fossil fuel project can displace a "dirtier" fossil fuel project. Regardless of the source, we need to reduce consumption of fossil and biomass fuels. Cutting down a forest to burn the wood chips as a fuel, as a cleaner fuel, still releases CO<sub>2</sub>.