

# **Reflections on cooperative approaches design from observed current practice**

UNFCCC Article 6.2 Ambition Dialogue – 13 June 2026

Michel Ardohain – European Union

# 1. Contribution to NDC, LT-LEDS and Paris Agreement goals

***Glasgow guidance, para 4(f): Each participating Party shall ensure that [...] its participation contributes to the implementation of its NDC and long-term low-emission development strategy, if it has submitted one, and the long-term goals of the Paris Agreement***

## Challenges and lessons learned:

- On the 13 TER reports published on the CARP to date:
  - 5/5 “inconsistencies” (pre-Baku reports)
  - 0/8 “significant inconsistencies” (post-Baku reports)
- Challenging but key requirement
- Guidance not detailed, and little information provided in the IRs => difficult for:
  - the Parties to know how to assess whether they achieve the requirement;
  - the reviewers to assess the information provided

## Enabling tools (non exhaustive):

- PACM Host Party participation requirements
- Some capacity-building initiatives and tools on “strategic” assessment” (e.g.: UNFCCC [Article 6 Academy](#)), but need better balance between “administrative readiness” and “strategic assessment”
- The guidance could be made more explicit on how this requirement could be demonstrated

## 2. No net increase in global emissions

**Glasgow guidance, para 18(h)(i): *Describe how each cooperative approach ensures environmental integrity, including that there is no net increase in global emissions within and between NDC implementation periods***

**Baku guidance: *additional information requested on avoidance of lock-in, sharing of mitigation outcomes, etc.***

### Challenges and lessons learned:

- On the 13 TER reports published on the CARP to date:
  - 5/5 “inconsistencies” (pre-Baku reports)
  - 8/8 “significant inconsistencies”, 8/8 did not provide the supplementary information (post-Baku reports)
- Challenging for the reviewers to assess in absence of clear reference to standards and methodologies used
- Avoidance of Lock-in risk: difficult to assess in absence of references to tools used
- Sharing of mitigation outcomes: impossible to assess in absence of information provided

### Enabling tools (non exhaustive):

- Baku supplementary information can facilitate, smoothen and accelerate the review
- Tools available under the market to assess robustly the risk of “overcrediting”: PACM robust rules, meta-standards and labels, assessment frameworks, credit rating services, among others.
- PACM brand new tool to support lock-in risk analysis
- Need to complement the guidance on missing aspects (e.g. additionality), well covered by the PACM

### 3. Quantification integrity

**Glasgow guidance, para 18(h)(ii): *Describe how each cooperative approach ensures environmental integrity through robust, transparent governance and the quality of mitigation outcomes, including through conservative reference levels, baselines set in a conservative way and below BAU emission projections (including by taking into account all existing policies and addressing uncertainties in quantification and potential leakage)***

**Baku guidance: *additional information requested on baselines, conservativeness, uncertainties, leakage, etc.***

#### Challenges and lessons learned:

- On the 13 TER reports published on the CARP to date:
  - 5/5 “inconsistencies” (pre-Baku reports)
  - 8/8 “significant inconsistencies”, 8/8 did not provide the supplementary information (post-Baku reports)
- Challenging for the reviewers to assess in absence of clear reference to standards and methodologies used

#### Enabling tools (non exhaustive):

- Baku supplementary information can facilitate, smoothen and accelerate the review
- Innovative and forward-looking Baseline approach in the PACM => benchmark that is inspiring other crediting programmes (e.g. Gold Standard)
- Conservativeness, uncertainties management, leakage: PACM and other similarly robust crediting standards

## 4. Risk of non-permanence

**Glasgow guidance, para 18(h)(iii): *Describe how each cooperative approach ensures environmental integrity by minimizing the risk of non-permanence of mitigation across several NDC periods and how, when reversals of emission reductions or removals occur, the cooperative approach will ensure that these are addressed in full***

**Baku guidance: *additional information requested on risk assessment and how reversals are monitored, quantified and addressed***

### Challenges:

- On the 13 TER reports published on the CARP to date:
  - 9/13 are about activities with no risk of permanence
  - 1/1 “inconsistency” (pre-Baku) and 3/3 “significant inconsistencies” (post-Baku)
- Several challenges to assess integrity where:
  - the reversal risk is planned to be addressed only for a limited period of time, e.g. 40 or 50 years;
  - a buffer pool is used as the main approach to address reversals;
  - other approaches are used.

### Enabling tools (non exhaustive):

- Baku supplementary information can facilitate, smoothen and accelerate the review
- Innovative thinking welcome, e.g. PACM exploring alternative means, ICVCM exploring innovative compensation mechanisms
- Additional user-side safeguards, such as like-for-like approaches or temporary crediting with replacement obligation approaches

# Some takeaways and suggestions...

- ✓ Invite the Secretariat to undertake a **comprehensive lessons-learned exercise** on all the relevant Initial Report items for the Article 6.2 Synthesis report to be considered at COP31
- ✓ Encourage Parties to systematically provide in Initial Reports **clear references to the standards and methodologies used** for generation of ITMOs
- ✓ More synergies between the **Article 6.2 guidance** and the **Article 6.4 PACM** standards and methodologies
- ✓ Prioritise **capacity-building** efforts on strategic considerations such as the contribution of the cooperative approaches with Parties' NDC and national climate strategies implementation