

Results relating to Article 6 at SBSTA58

June 2023

A6.2 Cooperative Approaches: Conclusions

Agreements and notes by SBSTA

- Took note of the submissions from Parties and the workshops held intersessionally (para. 2)
- Took note of the technical paper on the initial report and the informal report on the draft AEF (para. 3)
- Took note of the informal note prepared by the co-facilitators to capture the views of Parties on paragraphs 4, 16(a), 17 & 22 of decision 6/CMA.4 (para. 4)
- Took note of the estimated budgetary implications of activities to be undertaken by the secretariat (para. 18)
- Requested that the actions of the secretariat called for in the conclusions be undertaken subject to the availability of financial resources (para. 19)
- Agreed to continue consideration of this matter at SBSTA59 (para. 20)

Requests and invitations to SBSTA Chair

- Requested to **prepare an informal document, including textual proposals and a revised draft version of the AEF,** informed by the views of Parties and the intersessional work, **for consideration at SBSTA 59** (para. 8)
- Regarding paragraphs 16(a) and 17 of decision 6/CMA.4, that correspond to paragraph 9 of decision 7/CMA.4, invited to **consider organizing, at SBSTA 59, a joint meeting as part of the informal consultations on the A6.2 guidance and the A6.4 RMP,** in order to prepare for consistent outcomes at CMA 5 (para. 16)

Invitations to Parties and observers

- Invited to submit before SBSTA 59 views on the **matters* in paragraphs 16(a), 17 and 22 of decision 6/CMA.4,** to be taken into account where timing permits in preparing the technical paper and the workshop, for consideration at SBSTA 59 (para. 5) *Special circumstances of the LDCs & SIDS, sequencing of report and review, first transfer, common nomenclature, manual on the initial report, etc.
- Invited Parties to make contributions to the Trust Fund for Supplementary Activities (para. 17)

Requests to the secretariat

- Requested to **prepare a technical paper on (a) process of authorization, (b) draft AEF, (c) international registry and common nomenclature, (d) analysis and sequencing of the steps in reporting and review processes** and to **organize a hybrid workshop** (in conjunction with the workshop on A6.4) (para. 6, 7)
- Requested to prepare a technical paper on (e) inconsistencies identified (para. 6)
- Requested, in developing the manual, to consider including therein explanations of key terms and concepts, templates, etc. The first version of the manual should be made available by the end of 2023 (para. 9)
- Requested to **provide regular updates on the status of the work on the capacity-building programme** and to prioritize activities related to the preparation of the initial report (para. 10)
- Requested to conduct **a survey of Parties on (1) their choice between establishing a national registry or using the international registry** and on **(2) when they are planning to submit their initial report, as well as their capacity-building needs** (para. 15)

* Matters referred to in para. 9 of decision 7/CMA.4: emission avoidance and conservation enhancement activities, authorization by the host Party, and connection of the mechanism registry

A6.2 Cooperative Approaches: Informal Note

Draft version of the agreed electronic format (AEF)

Work needed before finalizing the AEF

- The content, timing and format of the types of authorization
- How the AEF should reflect the definition of what a cooperative approach is
- The sequence of the reporting obligations
- The rules applicable to the first transfer of ITMOs authorized for use towards NDCs and OIMPs
- How arrangements with underlying registries can be implemented in a manner that ensures consistency in the data available to Party registries and the international registry for the purposes of preparing the AEF
- How the accounting audit trail should be maintained from the ITMOs to the underlying units, and how to report when transactions happen in the underlying registries
- The links between the information in the AEF and other information required for reporting by the A6.2 guidance, as well as the design and use of the CARP and the Article 6 database

Clarification needed to improve the draft AEF

- Key terms and concepts, such as use, cancellation and retirement
- Sectors and activity types
- Common nomenclatures, including which table columns of the AEF require common nomenclatures
- What constitutes a first international transfer in relation to authorization of the use of ITMOs towards NDCs
- Where the first transfer specification is reported
- The link between the AEF and the annual information to be provided in the regular information report as per paragraph 23 of the A6.2 guidance
- How to include further information in the tables in the draft AEF
- How changes to information in the AEF will be managed
- How the information in the AEF will be reconciled with the summary information in the structured summary required pursuant to paragraph 77(d) of the annex to decision 18/CMA.1 as part of the BTR
- The content of the footnotes and how they can be further improved
- How the results of the consistency check of the AEF will be considered in the A6TER with a view to elaborating a process for identifying persisting inconsistencies

Information needed to be included in the finalized AEF

- SoP & OMGE: The mandatory and voluntary SoP and OMGE have to be clearly identifiable, and a summary table should also be included/ No special provisions are required.

Layouts of the AEF

- Information on authorization can be reported in its own table/ Information can be organized in separate tables for easy access, for example by action type/ The information, for example by action type, as mentioned on the left can form the basis of summary tables

A6.2 Cooperative Approaches: Informal Note

Sequencing and timing of the submission of the initial report (IR), its review and the submission of the AEF

- The IR and its review should be completed before the Party can submit the AEF and the regular information./ The review of the IR and any updated initial report (UIR) must be completed prior to the submission of the annual information and the regular information./ The status of the IR review should be kept up to date on the CARP and it is the basis for the submission of an AEF./ There may be circumstances under which the IR, the AEF and the regular information in the BTR are submitted at the same time./ There is no need for further guidance on the sequencing and timing.

Reviews specifying recommended action to be taken when inconsistencies are identified, and provisions on how a Party should respond to those recommendations and the implications of non-responsiveness, if any

- Unresolved inconsistencies after two reviews indicate a clear persistence and these should be reported in the CARP and made public in the conclusions and recommendations of the A6 TER team. If required, the Paris Agreement Implementation and Compliance Committee can be involved./ Persistent inconsistencies shall be forwarded to the Paris Agreement Implementation and Compliance Committee./ Even if there is non-responsiveness or no agreement on addressing inconsistencies, the Article 6.2 reports must be made public, clearly identifying the inconsistencies, allowing stakeholders to form their own opinion on the cooperative approach.

Process of identifying, notifying and correcting inconsistencies in data on ITMOs in the A6 database

- The proposal was made that inconsistencies should be identified through the AEF and prevented in subsequent submissions through appropriate formats and incentives for providing comprehensive information.

Modalities for reviewing confidential information

- Additional guidance is needed, including a definition of confidential information, a specific code of conduct for the treatment of confidential information, a process for dealing with cases in which the basis of confidentiality is not clear, how the A6TER team would report inconsistencies if it identifies them in confidential information./ Additional guidance is needed but it should be aligned with practices under the existing UNFCCC review processes./ There is no need for further guidance because the practices under the existing UNFCCC review processes serve as a reference./ There is no need for further guidance because decision 6/CMA.4, annex II, chapter VII, already addressed this matter.

A6.2 Cooperative Approaches: Informal Note

Matters related to the international registry

Purpose of the international registry

- Providing an interim solution for Parties that have not yet implemented their national registry/ Providing a permanent arrangement for Parties that will use it

Interoperability between the international registry, the A6.4 mechanism registry and participating Party registries

- The international registry shall only be capable of pulling and viewing data and information on holdings and the action history of authorized A6.4ERs./ The left option, with the possibility of connecting the international registry and participating Party registries to the Article 6.4 mechanism registry for the transfer of A6.4ERs./ The left option, with the possibility of connecting the international registry to participating Party registries for the transfer of ITMOs.

Accounts in the international registry

- Only participating Parties should have access to accounts in the international registry./ Both participating Parties and authorized entities may open accounts.

A6.2 Cooperative Approaches: Informal Note

Process for authorization

Authorization types

- Different authorization types should be authorization of the cooperative approach, the use of ITMOs and entities./ An authorization of the use of ITMOs is general in nature and may refer to a system and the parameters of what is authorized within that system.

Format for authorization

- Authorization should follow a template that is standardized and user-friendly./ Authorization should not follow any template or particular format.

Timing of authorization

- At any time/ Before the generation of mitigation outcomes/ After the generation of mitigation outcomes/ Before or at the time of first transfer/ After the Party has demonstrated that it has achieved its NDC

Process for managing changes to authorization

- The process should be addressed at the cooperative approach level.
- The process should be clarified and included in the authorization of the use of ITMOs.
- For changes to authorization before transfer, it is sufficient to report the changes for transparency./ It is not sufficient to report the changes for transparency.

Scope of changes to authorization

- Any changes can be made as this is a matter of national prerogative./ Changes have to be limited to those that do not affect the amount of ITMOs and their authorized uses./ The acquiring Party cannot change the authorized use for the ITMOs./ Changes to authorization are not possible, except for in the special circumstances.

Timing when changes to authorization can be made

- Before transfer/ Before first transfer/ After issuance of ITMOs with the agreement of the participating Parties/ After the agreement of the cooperative approach and the application of corresponding adjustments/ At any time according to the agreement underpinning the cooperative approach and the type of changes Parties may have agreed to accept

Limits to and implications of changes to authorization

- Revocation of authorization is not possible/ Different types of revocation are possible/ Revocation cannot have a retroactive effect/ In case of revocation after either transfer or first transfer, the change will affect only ITMOs that have not yet been transferred or first transferred/ For changes to authorization of use after transfer or first transfer, whether the ITMOs have been used or cancelled has to be considered./ For changes of authorization of entities, the change cannot have a retroactive effect for already conducted activities./ Any implications of changes to authorization are to be managed according to the agreement underpinning the cooperative approach and the type of changes Parties may have agreed to accept.

A6.2 Cooperative Approaches: Informal Note

Application of decision 2/CMA.3, annex, paragraph 2, on mitigation outcomes authorized by a participating Party for use towards achievement of a NDC and for OIMPs

Timing when the first transfer would occur and corresponding adjustments

- The first transfer should be the earlier point in time between the international transfer of the mitigation outcome and the first transfer as specified by the first transferring Party./ The cooperative approach authorization should specify which first transfer criteria should be applied and how first transfer is determined when the use of ITMOs is authorized for both purposes.

Specification of first transfer

- Shall be defined as part of the authorization provided pursuant to paragraph 18(g) of the A6.2 guidance in the initial report./ Shall be the same for all ITMOs authorized under a cooperative approach.

Communication process for notifying the first transferring Party when an ITMO has been used or cancelled in another registry

- The following was proposed:
 - The communication process can be clarified in the cooperative approach authorization and reported in the initial report;
 - The bilateral agreement between participating Parties should implement the communication process.

Common nomenclatures

Specific elements to be included in specific common nomenclatures

- Should include an indication of whether A6.2 activities reflect contributions to SoP and OMGE./ There is no need to differentiate elements on the basis of SoP and OMGE.

Further consideration of the special circumstances of the LDCs and SIDS

- The following was proposed:
 - Provide an open-ended mandate to continuously evaluate and review the consideration of the special circumstances
 - Establish basic principles and guidelines on how to address the consideration of the special circumstances as a continuous process
 - Identify and prioritize key areas for immediate action regarding the special circumstances and define the next steps on the basis of progress
 - Integrate experience and knowledge from existing mechanisms into the Article 6.2 negotiations process to provide insights into how the special circumstances can be accommodated in alignment with the Paris Agreement
 - Consider existing decisions in relation to capacity-building for developing countries that may be relevant to A6.2 activities
 - With regard to flexibilities in the A6.2 reporting process, recognize the same flexibility as in Articles 4 and 13/ The A6.2 guidance does not envisage flexibility with regard to the scope and frequency of reporting
 - With regard to the flexibility, delaying reporting on ITMOs might not be beneficial, and capacity-building would be more advantageous.

A6.2 Cooperative Approaches: Informal Note

Options for funding the activities related to the infrastructure and the technical expert review

General views

- The elements that require funding and information on costs estimates are:
 - ✓ The international registry;
 - ✓ Interoperability arrangements for the international registry;
 - ✓ The A6TER process;
 - ✓ The CARP and the A6 database;
 - ✓ Many other activities under Article 6.2 are yet to be conducted.
- It is important to identify how participating Parties can be charged for the costs of services related to A6.2 and with regard to infrastructure the objective is for the infrastructure to become self-financing.
- There are concerns about creating infrastructure that will not be used later on.

Funding

- The A6.4 methodology for charging fees should be considered when considering options for charging fees for the costs related to the operation of the A6.2 infrastructure and review activities.
- It is important to have a breakdown of the costs in the upcoming technical paper. With regard to the estimated costs for the development of the international registry it is necessary to provide cost estimates for a solution with functionalities that enable the transfer of units.
- It is important to conduct a survey of Parties to obtain a realistic assessment of the potential uptake of infrastructure and the scope of A6TER activities in order to estimate the associated costs.

A6.2 Cooperative Approaches: Informal Note

Manual for the initial report, updated initial report and regular information

General views

- The value of the manual for capacity-building in relation to reporting was underscored.
- Organizing a workshop on the development of the manual may be helpful.

Content of the manual

- Should be developed on the basis of best practice for existing manuals under the UNFCCC process.
- Should be elaborated in a manner that ensures consistency and transparency of the IR and RI, particularly in relation to accounting issues.
- Should promote uniformity in reporting and trust and credibility of A6 system.
- Should be simple, while still providing necessary explanations in accordance with the agreed reporting requirements.
- Should assist in understanding the outlines and tables for the IR and support the completion of the report.
- Should assist with understanding the information flow from the IR through annual information to RI, including how changes to submitted information can be managed, specifically with regard to the AEF submission.
- Should aim to assist with reducing risks related to inconsistencies, while also assisting Parties with limited capacity in developing and submitting their IR at the earliest possible date.
- Should be developed in a manner that explains the elements contained in each of the relevant paras of the A6.2 guidance that stipulate multiple reporting requirements; for example, the manual should contain illustrative elements of information in relation to each element of para. 18(h)(ii).
- With regard to the IR, should encourage inclusion of information not only in accordance with the corresponding requirements for IRs, but also information that would be useful for showing the transparency of subsequent reporting through UIRs and RI.
- Should be of a practical nature.
- Should provide explanations of key terms and concepts.
- Should be informed by A6.4 mechanism activities.
- Should contain: examples and case studies that are not country-specific; questions and answers; templates.
- Should be responsive to the needs of participating Parties:
 - ✓ **Option 1:** Clarify what it means for a participating Party to have arrangements in place for authorizing the use of ITMOs towards achievement of NDCs pursuant to A6.3;
 - ✓ **Option 2:** Such clarification is not needed as Parties have different national circumstances and this issue may be dealt with in relation to capacity-building.
- Should illustrate how Parties might approach the quantification of different types of NDC.
- Should lay out the implications of single-year and multi-year accounting approaches, and include guidance on approaches to trajectories and budgets, as well as on methods.
- Should elaborate on what a cooperative approach is, inter alia, whether it is a framework for participatory engagement or an individual mitigation activity.
- Should illustrate how participation contributes to the implementation of the NDC of the reporting Party and its LT-LEDS, and the long-term goals of the Paris Agreement in a manner that:
 - ✓ Enables understanding of the cumulative impact of the cooperative approaches in which the reporting Parties participate, including when reported over time through the IR and UIR;
 - ✓ Reflects the activities under the A6.4 mechanism.
- Regarding what a cooperative approach is:
 - ✓ **Option 1:** Provide an explanation, including how this links to the cooperative approach agreement;
 - ✓ **Option 2:** Do not provide an explanation.
- Should not be confusing with regard to the scope of reporting.
- Should not expand the scope of the manual beyond its original intent, asserting that it should assist participating Parties in completing their reports and not guide them on specific aspects of designing their cooperative approaches or national arrangements.
- Should not focus only on the link between the cooperative approach and mitigation targets.
- Should not illustrate what a cooperative approach is.
- Should not illustrate how a participating Party should respond in relation to inconsistencies identified in relation to its reporting.

Process for the manual

- A proposed timeline by the end of 2023 and a draft version as soon as practically possible in the intersessional period before CMA 5, taking into account the operational plans of the secretariat.
- An approach for providing regular updates on the basis of inputs by Parties and developments to the A6.2 reporting process.
- The need for emphasis on further developing the examples included in the manual.

A6.2 Cooperative Approaches: Informal Note

Tables for submitting annual information as part of the regular information, as referred to in decision 2/CMA.3, annex, paragraph 23(j)

General views

- The information reported as per para. 23(j) of the A6.2 guidance, provides an overview of the activities carried out under the cooperative approaches.
- A table in the SBSTA Chair's informal document on A6.2 of October 2022 can be used, with the AFOLU sector being separated into the agriculture and LULUCF sectors since those sectors are separated in the reporting under A13.
- Aggregating the annual information by year, by cooperative approach, and by other elements will be useful.
- The CARP can elaborate the table containing the information requested in para. 23(j) of the A6.2 guidance to facilitate the reporting.
- There is a link between the information submitted as per para. 23 of the A6.2 guidance, and the information required in the structured summary under A13, as the information reported as per para. 23 (except for subpara. (j)) needs to be included in the structured summary.
- The work on developing the tables as per para. 23 of the A6.2 guidance was not completed at CMA 4 and could be continued at CMA 5, despite the mandate referring to para. 23(j) of the A6.2 guidance.

Options for reporting of annual information as part of the regular information

- **Option 1:** The regular information is reviewed separately from the structured summary and therefore the information should be provided in a specific format.
- **Option 2:** Not reporting regular information in a table since all the information will be part of the CARP and will be included in the structured summary.

Options for the layout of the information to be submitted as per para. 23(j) of the A6.2 guidance

- **Option 1:** Provide separate summary tables for cooperative approaches and ITMOs transferred, first transferred, used towards other international mitigation purposes and used towards NDCs;
- **Option 2:** Provide separate tables for each level of information, including Parties and sectors.

Review process of the information in para. 23 of the A6.2 guidance

- The information reported as per para. 23(j) of the A6.2 guidance is less useful for the reviewers since they have access to the AEF and the results of the consistency check.
- The A6TER team should have full access to and take into account the interlinkages between the AEF, the annual information as part of the regular information, the structured summary and the consistency checks to ensure coherence of the reported information.

A6.2 Cooperative Approaches: Informal Note

Methods for converting the non-greenhouse gas metric

General views

- The best available science and thorough methodological work are required in order to avoid discrepancies caused by conversion of ITMOs metrics.
- It is important to ensure that no net increase in emissions results from implementing cooperative approaches on the basis of non-GHG metrics.
- It is important to use well-established methodological guidelines for measurement and conversion of non-GHG metrics, that should be, for project-based activities, comparable or identical to those accepted under the Article 6.4 mechanism.
- The work should focus on how to reflect non-GHG metrics and their conversion in the AEF, including the question of common nomenclatures necessary to enable reporting, such as the nomenclatures of possible metrics and units.
- Parties should proceed with the implementation phase of A6.2 and return to the topic of conversion when there are real practical examples of the use of non-GHG metrics.

Approach to conversion

- It shall be transparently communicated by Parties through the initial report and regular information, including how each cooperative approach they participate in handles measurement of mitigation outcomes in non-GHG metrics, including eventual conversion.
- The conversion methods applied should exclude, or at least explain, any discrepancies resulting from conversion in the amount of ITMOs and this information will be subject to consistency checks and technical expert review.
- Adequate methodological robustness should ensure that the amount of ITMOs in a non-GHG metric acquired by a participating Party does not exceed the amount of ITMOs in the non-GHG metric of the participating Party initiating the transfer, or at least explain the discrepancy.

A6.4 RMPs : Conclusions

Agreements and notes by SBSTA

- Took note of the synthesis report by the secretariat on the views submitted by Parties and observer organizations on the matters referred to in para. 9 of decision 7/CMA.4 (para. 2)
- Took note of the informal note prepared by the co-facilitators for this agenda item to capture the views expressed by Parties at this session on the matters referred to in para.9 of decision 7/CMA.4 (para. 3)
- Recalled para. 11 of decision 7/CMA.4, whereby the secretariat was requested to organize a technical expert dialogue (TED), to be held before SBSTA 59 (para. 4)
- Agreed to also take into account the views expressed by Parties at this session at the TED (para. 5)
- Regarding the matters referred to in para. 9 of decision 7/CMA.4 and the corresponding matters under A6.2, agreed to discuss the related issues in joint sessions during the TED in order to inform consistent outcomes on the related matters for CMA 5 (para. 6)
- Took note of the estimated budgetary implications of activities to be undertaken by the secretariat (para. 11)
- Requested that the actions of the secretariat called for in the conclusions be undertaken subject to the availability of financial resources (para. 12)
- Agreed to continue consideration of this matter at SBSTA 59 (para. 13)

Requests and invitations to SBSTA Chair

- Requested to **prepare an informal document, including textual proposals for consideration at SBSTA 59**, on the basis of the views expressed by Parties at this session and the outcomes of the TED and the submissions (para. 9)
- Regarding para. 9 of decision 7/CMA.4 and their relation to the corresponding matters under the cooperative approaches referred to in A6.2, invited to **consider organizing, at SBSTA 59, a joint meeting for the informal consultations on the A6.2 guidance and the A6.4 RMP**, in order to prepare for consistent outcomes at CMA 5 (para. 10)

Invitations to Parties and observers

- Invited to **submit via the submission portal by 15 September 2023 views on the matters referred to in para. 9 of decision 7/CMA.4** for consideration at SBSTA 59 (para. 8)

Requests to the secretariat

- Requested that the secretariat **organize the TED** to also allow virtual participation (para. 7)

A6.4 RMPs : Informal Note

Emission avoidance and conservation enhancement activities

Definition and concept

- There is a need / no need for clarity and a common understanding regarding which activities could be categorized as emission avoidance or conservation enhancement activities.
- Priority should be given to operationalizing the A6.4 mechanism over developing a complicated taxonomy.
- It is important to ensure consistency and integrity in all activity types covered by A6.2 and A6.4, due to the linkage between them.

Whether A6.4 activities could include emission avoidance and conservation enhancement activities

- All mitigation activities can be considered as either of the two categories: emission reduction or removal activities, and it is not necessary to specify or include any new category of mitigation activity.
- A6.4 activities shall / shall not include emission avoidance activities.
- There is a need for the CMA to provide guidance to the Supervisory Body on this matter. / It is not necessary to create another track at the CMA level in addition to the ongoing mandated discussions on removals under the Supervisory Body.
- The focus should be on real emission reductions and removals and should not credit carbon stocks.

A6.4 RMPs : Informal Note

Authorization by the host Party

Timing of providing authorization

- Authorization is a national prerogative and can be provided at any time as per the need of the host Party. Flexibility should be provided to host Parties in the light of their different capacities and needs.
- Authorization shall be provided at the timing that enables the implementation of decision 7/CMA.4, annex I, para. 38, whereby the mechanism registry administrator assigns the authorization status at the time of issuance of A6.4ERs.
- Other possible specific timings for providing authorization are:
 - ✓ As early as possible;
 - ✓ In conjunction with the approval of the activity by the host Party;
 - ✓ After validation of the activity;
 - ✓ At registration of the activity;
 - ✓ At registration of the activity, with the possibility to provide authorization again prior to each issuance;
 - ✓ After verification of emission reductions or removals;
 - ✓ After verification of emission reductions or removals but before issuance of A6.4ERs;
 - ✓ After verification of emission reductions or removals, in the context of the GHG inventory of the host Party;
 - ✓ Prior to issuance of A6.4ERs;
 - ✓ At issuance of Article 6, paragraph 4, emission reductions (A6.4ERs);
 - ✓ Before the first transfer of A6.4ERs.
- The timing of providing authorization under A6.4 needs to be consistent with that under A6.2.
- The timing of providing authorization is linked to discussions on the activity cycle procedure to be developed by the Supervisory Body, thus it would be useful to wait for the outcome of those discussions and address this timing issue at the next session of the SBSTA.
- Any authorization after issuance would have impacts on the corresponding adjustment in relation to SOPs and OMGE.
- The timing of providing authorization needs to be set in a way that does not retroactively affect any preceding processes and that does not obstruct host Parties' capacity to implement their NDCs and LT-LEDS.

Information to be included in the statement on authorization

- The content of the statement is a national prerogative and can be determined by the host Party.
- The list of information in the synthesis report could be used as a starting point for further consideration.
- The format of the statement should be accessible and user-friendly. Templates and guidance should be provided to support countries in filling in the necessary information. The statement template should contain the minimum information to be provided, with options available to provide additional information. The statement template should be consistent with the AEF.
- It is important in the statement to clarify the unit types by authorization, unit uses, active confirmation for non-authorized units, authorization vintages and activity type.
- This is linked to discussions on the activity cycle procedure to be developed by the Supervisory Body
- The statement should include a risk management provision (e.g. specify whether the host Party considers potential revision, and if yes, how this could be implemented), at the discretion of the host Party.

Possibility for revision and/or revocation of the authorization

- Revision and/or revocation is a national prerogative and can be determined by the host Party. Flexibility to revise or revoke the authorization should be considered in light of different capacities of host Parties.
- Revision and/or revocation should be avoided as much as possible, and allowed only in exceptional circumstances, noting that it is important to clarify under which conditions authorization can be revised and/or revoked and how it could be implemented accordingly.
- Revision and/or revocation shall not be allowed.
- Once units are first transferred, or transferred to other Parties or entities, revision and/or revocation should not be allowed.

A6.4 RMPs : Informal Note

Connection between the mechanism registry and the intl registry and other registries

Purposes of the connection

- The mechanism registry shall: allow only the pulling and viewing of data and information / allow the transfer of units from the mechanism registry to the intl registry and national registries.
- Parties should be able to decide the purpose for which they will use the mechanism registry.
- It is important to clarify the cost implications for both functionalities mentioned (pulling and viewing of information and transfer of units, including to national registries).

Functionality of pulling and viewing of data and information

- It is important to understand how this could be implemented (e.g., through agreed standards that address the risk of data inconsistency).
- The data and information should be used for annual reporting, CARP and the Article 6 database.
- The mechanism registry shall, through Party accounts and other relevant accounts, provide all the necessary information to allow host Parties to fill in the required information for the annual and regular information reporting under A6.2 infrastructure and for the reporting of the structured summary under A13.
- The data and information pulled from the mechanism registry shall be available to national registries.

Transfer of units

- It is important to clarify how units could be transferred.
- National registries should be able to connect directly to the mechanism registry.
- Parties should transfer the units from the mechanism registry to the international registry or national registries only after they have achieved their NDC targets.
- For the transfer of mitigation contribution A6.4ERs, the following clarifications are needed:
 - ✓ Whether mitigation contribution A6.4ERs can be transferred from the mechanism registry to national registries for domestic purposes;
 - ✓ Whether there will be any possibility of mitigation contribution A6.4ERs in national registries being able to be transferred internationally following guidance under A6.2;
 - ✓ Given the fundamental difference between mitigation contribution A6.4ERs and authorized A6.4ERs, it is important to understand how changes in the authorization status of mitigation contribution A6.4ERs could affect corresponding adjustments in relation to SOPs and OMGE.
- The consideration of registries under A6.2 and A6.4 should be closely coordinated to ensure consistency.

Other views

- Capacity-building is important for countries to operationalize and utilize the connection among the mechanism registry, the international registry and national registries.
- National data should be confidential.
- Some national information may be confidential, in line with provisions on confidentiality under A6.2.