

**Submission by the Russian Federation on options for implementing the  
infrastructure requirements referred to in chapter VI of the annex  
(Recording and tracking)**

pursuant to paragraph 5 of FCCC/SBSTA/2022/L.12, paragraph 8 of 2/CMA.3

*August 2022*

Annex VI (Recording and tracking) to the Decision 2/CMA.3 provides that

29. *Each participating Party shall have, or have access to, a **registry** for the purpose of tracking and shall ensure that such registry records, including through unique identifiers, as applicable: authorization, first transfer, transfer, acquisition, use towards NDCs, authorization for use towards other international mitigation purposes, and voluntary cancellation (including for overall mitigation in global emissions, if applicable), and shall have accounts as necessary.*
30. *The secretariat shall implement an international registry for participating Parties that do not have or do not have access to a registry. The international registry shall be able to perform the functions set out in paragraph 27 above. Any Party may request an account in the international registry.*
31. *The international registry shall be part of the centralized accounting and reporting platform referred to in chapter VI.C below (Centralized accounting and reporting platform).*

*The Guidance on cooperative approaches referred to in Article 6, paragraph 2, of the Paris Agreement:*

- does not imply that the *registries* referred to in para 29 shall be operated by the Secretariat or any other institutional arrangement established by the decisions of the CMA or the Subsidiary Bodies;
- does not imply any mandatory linkages between the *registry* and the Article 6 Database and/or the CARP, except for national reporting under Article 6.2.

Further requirements for the *registries* should be derived taking into account:

- the intention to use the *registries* for the purposes of the Article 6 technical expert review;
- the variety of options for national authorization procedure;
- technical complications and financial costs of implementation.

### **General considerations**

Taking into account that some Parties have already established cooperative approaches and/or infrastructure for tracking of transferrable mitigation outcomes, that can be further employed to track ITMOs, it would be practical to lessen the burden on Parties that could arise from the necessity to make changes to this infrastructure. Therefore, a guidance on the implementation of national registries (registries which a Party has or has access to) should, to the extent possible, facilitate the use of national infrastructure that is operational or under development while ensuring sufficient transparency. In

order to accommodate this, the guidance should focus on the functions of the registries rather than specific solutions or formats.

So as to simplify the processes, the components of the infrastructure under Article 6.2 should be interconnected providing for the possibility of automatic data exchanges if the Parties choose to do so and as applicable.

## **Functions**

The essential functions of the registries are listed in the Annex VI (Recording and tracking) to the Decision 2/CMA.3. They imply that the registries shall have means to identify, whether the following actions were undertaken with regards to ITMOs:

- authorization, including specifically for use towards other international mitigation purposes;
- first transfer;
- transfer;
- acquisition;
- use towards NDCs;
- voluntary cancellation (including for overall mitigation in global emissions, if applicable).

Parties should have flexibility to choose the means to reflect this information, for example, through identifiers or their specific components or through other means. However, noting that registries should contribute to transparency of international transfers, the registries should ensure that the amounts of the abovementioned ITMOs are clearly stated and these amounts can be further specified at least by vintage, authorized purpose of use and cooperative approach. The Parties should have flexibility to provide for a more granular data with regards to specific ITMOs.

Additional functions of the registries, such as issuance, transfers, holding, use (retirement) and cancellation with regards to ITMOs and other mitigation outcomes, as well as information about the activity that resulted in these mitigation outcomes, should be neither restricted, nor required.

## **Accounts**

The registries should be required to have the accounts for:

- authorized ITMOs (single or multiple differentiated by the authorized purpose of use);
- acquired ITMOs;
- ITMOs used NDC.

The registries could also have accounts for cancellation, contributions for adaptation, as well as entities.

## **Guidance for the international registry**

With the understanding that the international registry shall perform the same functions that national registries, a more specific guidance would be required to operationalize it. This guidance can be further developed by the SBSTA for the consideration and

adoption by CMA5 and should cover the issues of data exchanges with the Parties that would use this registry, governance and procedures.

With a view to introduce less burden related to the operationalization of the international registry, its functions should be limited to those essential. Namely, it should have accounts for each Party that have information on the amounts of ITMOs:

authorized, with sub-division by the authorized purpose of use;

first transferred;

transferred;

acquired;

used towards NDC;

voluntary cancelled (including for overall mitigation in global emissions, if applicable).

The ITMOs on these accounts should be distinguished by vintage and cooperative approach.

### **Linkages with Article 6.4 registry**

Our understanding is that information on A6.4ERs that are ITMOs can be tracked via national registries or the international registry as relevant, while data exchanges between the Article 6.4 registry and the international registry can be automated.

### **Implications for the Article 6 database**

With a view to simplify reporting process, national registries should be allowed to submit annual information reported by Parties annually automatically directly to the Article 6 database. The international registry could have this function as well.

For the sake of better transparency Article 6 technical expert review teams could be given access to the Article 6 database for the time of the Article 6 technical expert review with due respect to the issues of confidentiality as applicable.