

# Consultation on the 2023 ACCU Scheme Review

## What we did



**Released an Issues Paper** in May, which received 323 submissions, of which approximately 70 responded to questions on the ACCU Scheme Review. Submissions can be viewed and downloaded [here](#).



**Hosted a public webinar** in October attended by more than 450 people.



**Held roundtables** with carbon experts, environmental organisations, agricultural industry and waste industry.



**Undertook targeted consultation**, to test certain recommendations with specialists.



**Met with First Nations organisations** involved in the ACCU Scheme.



**Analysed public submissions made to previous consultation processes:** Chubb Review; Safeguard Mechanism reforms; and the Nature Repair Market Bill.

## What we heard

### Securing Integrity

- Some support for mandatory transition to new methods but also concerns for the possible impacts of uncertainty on viability.
- Clarity sought for how the newness test will not discourage trialling of technologies, particularly to inform new methods.
- Desire for increased transparency to include assessment of project applications and carbon estimation areas for all projects.
- View that current permanence mechanisms need to be reviewed.
- Support for prioritising 100-year permanence periods, including to allow existing projects to shift to it.
- Identified barriers to nominating 100-year permanence periods, including impacts on land value and access to funding.
- View that carbon leakage is not well understood, including how it is assessed and managed.
- Concerns potential shorter crediting periods could impact viability of projects.
- Opposition to a scheme-level buffer, preference for reviewing and amending existing approaches.
- Calls to stop crediting purported low integrity projects.
- Claims the administration of some methods is inconsistent with their requirements.

### Non-Carbon Benefits

- Desire for the ACCU Scheme to support the achievement of environmental and social benefits.
- Views that claims of non-carbon benefits associated with ACCUs need to be verified and transparent.
- Views that linkages between the ACCU Scheme and Nature Repair Market should be carefully considered to ensure positive outcomes.
- Observations regional areas have unique contexts that need to be considered to build resilience, support multiple benefits and avoid adverse outcomes.
- Calls to strengthen requirements for ACCU projects to be consistent with Natural Resource Management (NRM) plans to improve environmental and economic project outcomes.
- Calls to expand the role of NRM plans and organisations to improve project and carbon resilience.

### Scaling Engineered Removals

- Support for scaling engineered removals.
- Views that higher ACCU prices will be needed to support this.
- Support for the CFI Act to be amended to include engineered forms of removals.
- Calls for new methods, including biochar, mineral carbonisation, and ocean alkalisation.

### First Nations People

- Diverse views about how to report and verify First Nations benefits, with broad agreement this be self-determined.
- Calls for method development processes to incorporate a First Nations perspective.
- Calls for stronger processes to ensure First Nations people receive equitable benefits and the principles of free, prior and informed consent be required.
- Calls for resources to support participation of First Nations people.

### Demand-side Integrity

- Views that vintage can inform best practice offsetting. A clear definition is needed.
- Conflicting views on allowing the use of international units. If they are used, they should be of equal or higher quality.
- Calls for more guidance for corporates, especially Safeguard facilities, on what best practice decarbonisation looks like.
- Calls for industry to have better visibility of ACCU prices to budget and make efficient long-term decisions.

The authority would like to thank the many individuals and organisations who contributed their time and expertise to this review. These contributions have improved the quality of the review and provided evidence to help inform the authority's recommendations and forward work program.