Commenter	Organization	W+ Document
Julianne Baroody	VCS	W+ Standard
Julianne Baroody	VCS	W+ Standard
Julianne Baroody	VCS	W+ Standard
	VCS	W+ Standard
Julianne Baroody	VCS	W+ Standard
Julianne Baroody	VCS	W+ Standard
Julianne Baroody	VCS	W+ Standard
Julianne Baroody	VCS	W+ Standard
Julianne Baroody	VCS	W+ Standard

Commenter	Organization	W+ Document

Julianne Baroody	VCS	W+ Standard
Julianne Baroody	VCS	W+ Standard
Julianne Baroody	VCS	W+ Standard
Julianne Baroody	VCS	W+ Standard
Margaret Bruce	WOCAN/W+	W+ Standard
Margaret Bruce	WOCAN/W+	W+ Standard
Julianne Baroody/Jianliang Zhang	VCS	W+ Standard / 2015 version - prior comments
Julianne Baroody/Jianliang Zhang	VCS	W+ Standard / 2015 version - prior comments
Julianne Baroody/Jianliang Zhang	VCS	W+ Standard / 2015 version - prior comments
Julianne Baroody/Jianliang Zhang	VCS	W+ Standard / 2015 version - prior comments
Julianne Baroody/Jianliang Zhang	VCS	W+ Standard / 2015 version - prior comments
Julianne Baroody/Jianliang Zhang	VCS	W+ Standard / 2015 version - prior comments

Julianne Baroody/Jianliang Zhang	VCS	W+ Standard / 2015 version - prior comments
Julianne Baroody/Jianliang Zhang	VCS	W+ Standard / 2015 version - prior comments
Julianne Baroody/Jianliang Zhang	VCS	W+ Standard / 2015 version - prior comments
Julianne Baroody/Jianliang Zhang	VCS	W+ Standard / 2015 version - prior comments
Julianne Baroody/Jianliang Zhang	VCS	W+ Standard / 2015 version - prior comments
Julianne Baroody/Jianliang Zhang	VCS	W+ Standard / 2015 version - prior comments
Julianne Baroody/Jianliang Zhang	VCS	W+ Standard / 2015 version - prior comments
Julianne Baroody/Jianliang Zhang	VCS	W+ Standard / 2015 version - prior comments

Julianne Baroody/Jianliang Zhang	VCS	W+ Standard / 2015 version - prior comments
Julianne Baroody/Jianliang Zhang	VCS	W+ Standard / 2015 version - prior comments
Julianne Baroody/Jianliang Zhang	VCS	W+ Standard / 2015 version - prior comments
Julianne Baroody/Jianliang Zhang	VCS	W+ Standard / 2015 version - prior comments

Comment	Response to Comment
I noticed that the comments that VCS provided during the 2015 review (of v1.2) were, for the most part, not adopted. Was anything published demonstrating how the comments on the earlier version were accounted for (as described in the ISEAL Standard Setting Code Clause 5.4 requirement 5)? I've attached our comments on v1.2, because they are for the most part still applicable for v1.3. A lot of them are editorial, but others are substantive (e.g., the recommendation to set out a separate document with fees), and it would be good to know how such material issues were/will be addressed.	WOCAN regrets not closing the loop on previously provided comments. To the extent the comments provided remain applicable, they have been considered and integrated into this version of the W+ Standard. Responses to 2015 comments are included in the second section of this responses to comments list.
Section 7 - Why use the terms verifier *and* assurance provider?	WOCAN understands that there are likely to be many different types of projects applying the W+ Standard. Some use the nomenclature of carbon projects, others may use the nomenclature of international development. The terms are interchangable. We will use 'verifier' consistently. The glossary explains that the terms are synonymous.
Section 7 - In this case does 'verifier' refer to the accreditation org or the verifier/assurance provider?	The language has been clarified so that is it clearly refers to an individual who is certified by an approved organization.
Section 7 - Again, why use the two terms (verification or certification)?	We have chosen one term, "Certification Statement" and added that, and the others to the Glossary.
Glossary - "See my comments below on the term Verifier. Where possible, I would advise that only one term be used for the same subject"	Comment acknowledged. We have chosen one term, "Verifier" and include additional language in the Glossary to make it clear that 'verifier' and 'assurance provider' are synonymous.
Glossary - This is among the terms included in the glossary that do not appear in be body of this document. Is there a reason these terms are included? If so, the glossary could use an introduction to explain it	The term in question "biogas digester" is not directly relevant to the standard itself and so has been deleted from the glossary.
Glossary - It is good that this concept ("Crediting Period") is introduced, but it should be referred to in the body of the standard. As it is, no one would come across it unless they were referring to the glossary for another reason	Comment acknowledged. The term 'crediting period' and the expectation for its description has been included in the language of the standard, in Section 5.1.
Glossary - Important to clearly define what *GHG crediting programs* are, and to then use this to refine the definition of each of the GHG crediting programs referred to in this document (i.e., CDM, Gold Standard, VCS).	Comment acknowledged and the changes have been made. Further eleboration of each crediting program remains an option.
Glossary alphabetization error	This has been corrected

Glossary - Validation of W+ domain methods should be addressed in the body of the standard	Comment acknowledged and the changes have been made.
Glossary - A verifier creates and issues findings and issues a verification decision based on its findings, which is documented in a verification report and/or statement (referred to earlier as a <u>Certification Statement)</u>	Comment acknowledged and the changes have been made.
Glossary - Will the verifier be the one to actually issue W+ certificates and units, or will that be W+? Earlier in the standard this is not mentioned.	Comment acknowledged and clarifying language has been added.
Glossary - corrections to the glossary entry describing the VCS.	Changes made.
Updates and corrections to nomenclature. Edits for clarity. Reconciliation with other W+ Program documents.	Changes made.
Edits or additions for conformity with ISEAL requirements or best practices recommendations. Include in Standard: non-discrimination statement and 'exceed regulatory requirements' statement.	Changes made.
the standard should only contain information on the requirements placed upon the entities/projects seeking to participate. All guidance on process and the WOCAN Program should go into the program guide.	Comment acknowledged and the changes have been made.
The first sentence of the exec. summary of the W+ Standards should introduce the W+ Standard. The paragraphs of this summary could be rearranged. I think somewhere there needs to be a reference to the fact that the standard is promoting gender equality in developing countries where there is a gender discrimination issue or something along those lines.	Comment acknowledged and the changes have been made.
Insert full definition for UNFCCC and cite references when other organizations or their documents are noted.	Comment acknowledged and the changes have been made.
In place of "carbon offset projects", VCS would say "greenhouse gas emission reduction and removal projects"	Comment acknowledged and the changes have been made.
Reasons for using the standard - " This section belongs in the program guide. It would be more effective combined with section 3 as "stakeholders of the W+ program"	Comment acknowledged and the changes have been made.
Regarding W+ Units - It may be useful to also talk a bit about what these units are used for. I.e. what does one unit represent?	Comment acknowledged and the changes have been made.

How the Standard is Adminstered - This also belongs in the program guide	Comment acknowledged and the changes have been made.
Might want to keep the fees in a separate document so that they can be updated more frequently than the standard. Fees updates require less consultation than standards updates.	Comment acknowledged and the changes have been made.
In "Project Initiation" - Is this part of the PIN as well? If so it should be nested in the same sub-section referencing the PIN and the information that the PIN should contain.	Comment acknowledged and the changes have been made.
Regarding PIN review times - Seems to be more process related, ideally the standard focuses on the intent and the content that the PIN should contain. The process related documents can go into the guide or a separate document. If one wants to include timelines, consider using flow charts to more clearly present the process graphically.	Comment acknowledged and the changes have been made.
Under Project Design - "Please consider including all the key instructions in the template and reword along the lines of 'PPD shall be completed following the instruction of the template' Focus this section on key principles of the PDD, i.e. public available and what to do with confidential information etc	Comment acknowledged and the changes have been made.
"Approval of applicable governing authority"...These need to be defined clearly – are they approvals for the underlying project, or just for the W+ components…?	Both W+ and "underlying" project activities should be confirmed as having secured any necessary approvals. The language for this requirement has been moved from the Standard and is now contained within the PDD.
Regarding PDD evaluation process: Process related guidance such as this may be more suitable in another document. Also when describing the process, please consider including information on the following steps, i.e. what comes after the WOCAN evaluation.	Comment acknowledged and the changes have been made.
A few things missing from the standard in general: - The concept of crediting period if there are any - Auditing requirements (validation and verification) and accreditation, if any - Establishing the baseline, use of methodologies, if any - Determining when the project starts (start date) for crediting purposes - Project scale limitations, if any - Additionality concepts - How will PDD deviations be handled?	Crediting period, now included. Auditing/validation-verification, now included. Establishing baseline, now included. Project start date, now included. Project scale limitations (none) now noted. Compliance with the W+ double counting policy, now included.

W+ Project Developer shall implement the project and in the course of that work shall, at a minimum, conduct and/or document the following - "Best to give where all of this is supposed to be documented, e.g. the monitoring report?	Comment acknowledged and the changes have been made.
Glossary, regarding Direct Share Payments - "This should be a definition, the meeting of project and standard requirements etc. should be included in the main body of the standard."	Comment acknowledged and the changes have been made.
Would need to address the double counting principal in the main body of the standard.	Comment acknowledged and the changes have been made. See Section 5.3.
Concept of "permanence" - Concept may need to be addressed in the main body of the standard	Agreed. WOCAN is open to the advice of stakeholders regarding "permanence". This concept will be addressed and completed as part of the second round of comments on the W+ Standard.