Section	Requirement	UK	Germany	Canada	UNFCCC	UN REDD		Response
General		On process requirements, it will be worth having simultaneous discussions alongside this re the general governance of SCALE and how TAG, PMT and PC interact, including on decisions on standards such as this FCPF version (current docs indicate slightly varied process on decision making/finalisation). And, how current FCPF contributors fit within this process	We welcome the role of the TAG. However, quite frankly, we feel that the participation of CFPs comes a little short – especially since we consider our active involvement as a contribution to the success of the CF. Have you considered giving CFPs a more active role in shaping the standard? And have you considered the implications when this is not the case?					It is important to note that one of the areas where we see limitations to meet the best practices in standard setting and credit issuing is the governance. The fact that donors are part of the standard board has several PROS, but it is seen by different principle setters as a potential area of Conflict of Intrest (COI). Therefore, the suggestion is to separate the governance of the standard (for both 1.0 and 1.5) to a separate arrangement as a SCALE TAG, or something similar. Since the TAG is not in place yet, two alternative options are proposed: either the CFPs act as the Board for now (but decision making separate from the CF decision making) or an independent Board is established
1.1 FCPF Standard Board	B.1	*The FCPF Standard Board ("the Board") is the main governance and decision making body of the FCPF Jurisdictional REDD+ Standard ("FCPF Standard").* Following these reviews, and the Jan discussion on FCPF standard (where it may be adopted)- will FCPF contributors have any further input into the standard, and how will we be linked into the Board? It will be worth having simultaneous discussions alongside this re the general governance of SCALE and how TAG, PMT and PC interact (including on decisions on standards - as current docs indicate slightly varied process on decision making/finalisation)						
	B.3	*The SCALE Standards Management Technical Advisory Groups (SM TAG) will act as the Board for the FCPF Standard.* Has this already been set up/what is the timeline for this? And will there be forest country representatives?						
	B.2					Are their any procedures in place that detail the conflict resolution mechanism to address potential conflicts of interest among Board members, ensuring unbiased decision-making?		In accordance with B.5, decisions in the Board are made on a concensus basis, or if this is not possible using a 2/3 majority. Under B.6, if there is a conflict oif interest, Board memebers might be asked to recuse themselves from the decision making
						Is there any structured nomination or selection process for Board members to ensure "diverse" representation and expertise?		The exact selection procedure will need to be decided later once the positioning and composition of the different bodies has been decided
1.2 SCALE Program Management Team (PMT)	B.7		In addition, we'd be interested in the composition of the PMT. Will this basically be the FMT? Given that REDD+ is highly specific, it is essential that this expertise is included in the PMT.					In the updated version of part B, the proposal is now that the FCPF FMT will act as the secretariat. This can be changed later if the management of the standard would be moved to SCALE or another entity.

	B.8					*World Bank procedures will apply to ensure that members of the SCALE PMT do not have a conflict-of-interest …* Better to highlight the procedures or provide link to such procedures to ensure transparency and maintain standard's integrity	A footnote has been added that links to the World Bank policy and procedure framework which includes the rules applying to World Bank staff and consultants
1.5 Updates to the FCPF Standard	B.13					It would also be good to specify the exact criteria or circumstances that might necessitate "urgent revisions" or updates between regular reviews. Also detailing the process for managing these urgent changes and their impact on ongoing ER Programs would ensure consistency and compliance.	Text was added to indicate this would occur to correct mistakes or provide clarification on the Standard
2.3 Issuance and buffers	B.26					While B.26 refers to the possibility of utilizing a third-party registry, subsequent sections specifically focus on CATS without mentioning any other registry or its role. If the intention is to highlight the potential room for utilization of a third-party registry, it's crucial to delineate its role, integration with CATS, and how it aligns with buffer management consistently across the section. If the primary focus remains on CATS, revising the text to emphasize and maintain consistency with CATS throughout this process might enhance clarity and understanding for stakeholders.	Additional reference to the option of a 3rd party registry have been added