**Comment/Explanation\*:***Include your justification for your proposed change to the draft standard below.*  
\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**A1-A3 + A5.3.** The approach to report A5.3 GWP along with A1-A3 GWP may lead to market confusion and inconsistency in reporting. We understand the importance of tracking waste and encouraging on-site management during construction; however, including A5.3 GWP in the reporting will be difficult to find in EPDs. Consistency of reporting is essential to build trust when measuring whole life carbon. When results vary widely due to differences in methodologies or rules, it creates confusion for designers, builders, and policymakers who rely on the data to make informed decisions.

While I understand that it is preferred to include waste, programs may not be set up to track waste when they are focusing on operational or embodied carbon. By aligning on consistent reporting practices, the committee can provide clarity, reduce misinterpretation, and support fair comparisons across materials and projects. This consistency strengthens the credibility of the results and ensures they can be confidently used to guide low-carbon design, procurement, and policy.

*We recommend only including A1-A3.*
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***~~+ A5.3~~***