CALL FOR INPUT 2025:

OWNERSHIP OF ACCOUNT HOLDINGS IN THE A6.4 MECHANISM REGISTRY

ADDRESSED TO:

THE SUPERVISORY BODY (SBM)

'Balancing Market Integrity and Institutional Protection: An Analysis of Registry Design Choices for International Carbon Credit Systems Under the UNFCCC Framework'

AUTHORED BY:

Tupsee R. S.

Mungroo Z. B. A.
Pierre J. D.

COPYRIGHT © 2025 TUPSEE R. S., MUNGROO Z. B. A., PIERRE J. D. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

COPYRIGHT © 2025 TUPSEE R. S., MUNGROO Z. B. A., PIERRE J. D. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

This paper is the intellectual property of Tupsee R. S., Mungroo Z. B. A., Pierre J. D. No part of this publication may be reproduced, distributed, or transmitted in any form or by any means, including photocopying, recording, or other electronic or mechanical methods, without prior written permission from the authors, except for brief quotations used in critical reviews or non-commercial purposes as permitted by copyright law.

The authors retain exclusive rights to modify, update, or alter the content of this research paper. No other individuals or entities are authorized to make changes to this document without explicit written consent from the authors.

For permission requests or inquiries regarding content modification, please contact:

rs.tupsee@learnblue.org.ng
z.mungroo@learnblue.org.ng
j.pierre@learnblue.org.ng

First Edition,

Authors,

Reeshabh Shayan Tupsee, *United Nations MGCY SDG12 Global Thematic Focal Point Sustainable Construction & Development and Gender & Climate Technology Expert / UN Climate Technology Centre & Network (CTCN), UNEP.*

Zakiyyah Bibi Azraa Mungroo, *United Nations MGCY SDG12 Global Thematic Focal Point Sustainable Lifestyles & Public Education and Gender & Climate Technology Expert / UN Climate Technology Centre & Network (CTCN), UNEP.*

Juan Didier Pierre, *United Nations MGCY SDG12 SIDS Regional Focal Point and Gender & Climate Technology Expert / UN Climate Technology Centre & Network (CTCN), UNEP.*

All authors contributed equally to the conception, drafting, and revision of this paper. The authors collectively approve the final version for submission and agree to be accountable for all aspects of the work.

COPYRIGHT © 2025 TUPSEE R. S., MUNGROO Z. B. A., PIERRE J. D. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

TABLE OF CONTENT

COPYRIGHT © 2025 TUPSEE R. S., MUNGROO Z. B. A., PIERRE J. D. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

COPYRIGHT © 2025 TUPSEE R. S., MUNGROO Z. B. A., PIERRE J. D. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

1. INTRODUCTION

Global carbon markets require the foundation of carbon market registries to enable tracking along with recording and transaction operations which protect carbon credit systems integrity. These official ledgers function as the registry to record all activities related to carbon credits from their issuance to their transfer and acquisition and eventual cancellation thus maintaining a comprehensive chain of custody and preventing duplicate counting. Climate finance registries have evolved to serve as essential connectivity platforms which integrate market stakeholders from various areas while advancing their operational complexity in the modern scenario. Carbon market effectiveness depends on registry system design because it shapes trustee confidence levels along with market actors' response and deliverance of climate change reduction goals.

UNFCCC-administered registries operate under distinct challenges which separate them from both private registry systems and national regulatory frameworks. These registries function within an international legal framework which lacks defined jurisdictional limits so they need to resolve diplomatic concerns against practical market needs. The UNFCCC Secretariat suffers from uncertain international legal position since it operates as an international entity which hampers its ability to handle liability cases and dispute resolution and traditional financial regulations. Registry operation must balance between national interests and global consistency standards to determine crucial aspects such as user rights and transaction procedures alongside information exposure criteria.

Researchers study the multiple policy factors which shape international carbon credit registry selection as they investigate the Article 6.4 system established through the Paris Agreement. This examination investigates registry system frameworks which handle market and institutional integrity through international governance framework standards. This research evaluates the relationship between control-based and ownership-based methodologies for account management to determine design elements that enable market development and institutional protection and environmental sustainability. The paper investigates alternative methods to resolve stakeholder issues while staying consistent with international legal frameworks that govern UNFCCC mechanisms.

2. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 Market Integrity in Climate Finance

The three core elements of transparency and accountability and trust together form the basis of functional carbon markets that make up market integrity in climate finance. Structural legitimacy within the carbon credit life cycle spans development phases up to the issuance of credits and their transfers to final usage. Strong systems need to exist for checking environmental statements together with transparent sales protocols and thorough patterns which defend against deception. The design of Article 6.4 mechanism registries needs to include systems that monitor authorization status while making appropriate modifications and maintaining auditable records about credit origins.

COPYRIGHT © 2025 TUPSEE R. S., MUNGROO Z. B. A., PIERRE J. D. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

The absence of essential elements leads to market uncertainty and it increases transaction costs because of additional due diligence requirements and may compromise the environmental effectiveness of the underlying system. Stakeholders need full assurance that mitigation credits accurately present authentic environmental results because they must invest in finance and take risks based on registry systems' precision and security performance.

2.2 Institutional Protection for International Organizations

International organizations need strong institutional protection as this factor stands as a primary building block for climate finance governance structures. The UNFCCC Secretariat executes administrative tasks across different climate mechanisms from a legal framework that offers limited jurisdictional protection which national regulatory bodies typically possess. The Secretariat faces a specific legal challenge because they lack both protection from multiple national jurisdictions and established dispute resolution methods. International organizational protection includes built-in protective measures of registry design and reactive systems to limit liability. International law under functional necessity requires international organizations to receive specific protections based on their mandated duties but commercial aspects of registry administration might exceed traditional diplomatic immunity protection. Designing a registry system needs to include specific limitations of institutional liability and provisions for indemnification in addition to clear jurisdictional boundaries which protect the institution against regulatory or legal threats.

2.3 Balancing Competing Policy Objectives

The process of designing registry systems demands complex navigational solutions between opposed policy aims that combine market success with institutional needs. The design requirements stemming from this fundamental commercial-versus-institutional tension cannot be solved by using simple ranking systems. Such frameworks need to establish innovative solutions which handle both market needs for assurance and institutional obligations for protection. The operation of this delicate balance becomes more challenging because of differing stakeholder needs and distinct national laws and changes within the carbon market sector. The core challenge derives from creating registry systems that provide market required ownership assurance and transfer capabilities and collateralization without jeopardizing the administrative authority of the overseeing body. Effective solutions for international registry success depend on national regulatory framework collaboration rather than seeking complete implementation within the international registry itself.

2.4 Risk Management in Registry Design

The risk management system for registries extends beyond traditional information protection models to develop complete plans for guarding against legal risks and operational problems and financial risks and reputational risks. The registry design must include multi-layered defenses to protect from system threats and process vulnerabilities through advanced security controls that prevent excessive costs for normal market operations.

COPYRIGHT © 2025 TUPSEE R. S., MUNGROO Z. B. A., PIERRE J. D. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

International legal risk management needs special attention because jurisdictional conflicts create complex uncertainties regarding standards enforcement procedures. Operational risk management systems need to handle technical system weaknesses and human process breakdowns by using redundant components and verification systems and providing clear operational procedures. The financial aspect of risk management covers system sustainability together with resource distribution and liability management. International carbon credit systems require stakeholder trust for maintaining their core legitimacy as well as operational excellence which reputational risk management addresses fully. A comprehensive risk management framework is needed to design registries effectively since it enables proper assessment and implementation of structural and procedural safeguards for multiple risks.

3. EVOLUTION OF CARBON REGISTRY SYSTEMS

3.1. Historical Development of UNFCCC Registries

Different phases in the development of international climate governance produced corresponding changes in market mechanisms which UNFCCC registries documented. The adoption of the Kyoto Protocol in 1997 led to the creation of initial registry systems because it established market-based flexibility mechanisms that needed reliable accounting infrastructure. The International Transaction Log (ITL) under the Kyoto Protocol established the first international registry system that functioned to connect and harmonize national registries which tracked assigned amount units (AAUs), emission reduction units (ERUs) and certified emission reductions (CERs). The original registry systems functioned primarily for administrative tasks rather than market functionality because their main purpose was accurate accounting. The development of UNFCCC registries proceeded through successive stages which included advanced features to handle implementation issues and market expansion requirements as well as counter fraud practices. Although the registry architecture expanded through time by enhancing security features it maintained its essential character as an international administrative framework instead of being a commercially oriented trading platform while adopting better transparency standards and standardized data protocols.

3.2. Clean Development Mechanism Registry Experience

Empirical knowledge from operating the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) Registry serves as vital guidance for developing registry frameworks based on Article 6.4 mechanisms. The CDM Registry introduced control-based rights management to users in 2005 although it explicitly omitted defining ownership rights to certified emission reductions. The registry designers settled for control-based user frameworks because they understood the legal constraints facing the UNFCCC Secretariat and the complicated ownership issues between jurisdictions. The operational existence of the CDM Registry proved control-based approaches valid yet exposed their inadequacy in enabling market expansion during its period of operation. The system faced problems when parties disagreed about the return process and there were difficulties obtaining financial support without strong collateral systems and countries applied different regulations to carbon credits.

COPYRIGHT © 2025 TUPSEE R. S., MUNGROO Z. B. A., PIERRE J. D. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

Through its operation the CDM Registry enabled substantial market activity while protecting the UNFCCC from major legal consequences which set important standards for modern registry design. During its operation CDM revealed the need for thorough account holder verification alongside transparent recordkeeping mechanisms and standardized operational procedures to safeguard system integrity.

3.3. Emergence of Private Carbon Registries

Voluntary carbon markets have undergone significant development because private registry systems entered the market and established themselves as operators. The Voluntary Carbon Standard (later Verra) and the Gold Standard established the initial private registries which added innovative features to the Voluntary Carbon Market by advancing UNFCCC-administered frameworks through better registry design and market facilitation and user engagement capabilities. The market needs of private registries led to innovative features which include project sub-accounts and retirement designations and beneficiary tracking to improve market performance. Even market-oriented registries like Verra require explicit statements about ownership determination because legal recognition across jurisdictions remains challenging according to their Terms of Use analysis. Private registry systems have expanded through multiple platforms while establishing diverse carbon market structures which maintain different standards together with procedural rules and security requirements. Market consistency faces difficulties because of the fragmented nature of registry systems which offers possibilities for testing different registry design methods. Private registry development demonstrates market needs and stakeholder preferences that guide the development of Article 6.4 mechanism registry structures.

3.4. Lessons from Financial and Securities Registries

The development of carbon market infrastructure draws lessons from financial and securities registries because these systems manage to achieve market facilitation and regulatory compliance across numerous regulatory areas. Central securities depositories have established advanced methods for differentiating ownership rights from control authority through a system of multi-level accounts which keep beneficial holder names distinct from those who manage accounts. The systems have built stable legal infrastructure for security interest recognition which upholds system integrity while avoiding administrative difficulties. Financial registry data reveals how establishments of clear governing law frameworks together with standardized dispute resolution systems and comprehensive liability frameworks spawn market confidence. The development of these systems demonstrates regular institutional integration of regulatory elements through operational procedures which now incorporate customer identification and beneficial ownership assessment protocols and transactional monitoring operations. The establishment of efficient market infrastructure through financial registry systems proves the necessity of standardized communication protocols together with interoperability frameworks and unified data standards. The distinctive characteristics of carbon registries present specific challenges but their governance elements from financial registries can be used to construct robust carbon markets with proper registry administrator protection.

COPYRIGHT © 2025 TUPSEE R. S., MUNGROO Z. B. A., PIERRE J. D. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

4. METHODOLOGY

4.1. Policy Analysis Framework

A multi-dimensional policy analysis framework serves this study for evaluating alternative registry design structures. A research design based on Institutional Analysis and Development (IAD) principles developed by Ostrom exists as modified for international environmental governance structures. The registry design evaluation matrix analyzes four essential evaluation standards to assess design choices: (1) jurisdictional consistency, (2) institutional vulnerability, (3) market operational effectiveness and (4) environmental protection reliability. The design criteria use separate indicators which provide measurable statistics when possible. The assessment of jurisdictional coherence relies on both conflict-of-laws evaluation and the identification of any insufficient or vacant governance areas. Experts measure organizational exposure risks by building probable liability forecasts that mirror different jurisdictional frameworks. Market functionality receives assessment through transaction cost analysis together with liquidity projection modeling. Environmental integrity assurance is tracked through two assessment methods including procedural safeguard mapping and verification pathway analysis. The policy analysis creates hypothetical scenarios which help discover hidden effects of different design choices while focusing on the relationships between Article 6.4 and additional carbon trading frameworks. The model offers a procedure for evaluating registry designs by utilizing set criteria which also acknowledges the intricate framework of international climate governance systems.

4.2. Stakeholder Interview Approach

Primary data collection includes semi-structured interviews with forty-seven stakeholders selected through stratified purposive sampling to ensure representation across five stakeholder categories: (1) registry administrators from both UNFCCC and private systems, (2) market participants including project developers and credit purchasers, (3) legal experts specializing in international environmental law and carbon markets, (4) financial intermediaries engaged in carbon market transactions, and (5) regulatory officials from diverse jurisdictions. The interview procedure starts by asking standardized registry requirements questions that lead to stakeholder-specific questions based on their expertise level. Modified Chatham House rules protected interview confidentiality during the process where institutions provided their names but research participants remained anonymous. Research participants allowed interviews to be transcribed while dual-coder thematic analysis was conducted using NVivo 14 software which deployed both deductive policy framework coding in addition to inductive coding methods. The kappa coefficient used to validate coder consistency reached a value of $\kappa=0.87$. Stakeholder response validation included member-checking procedures that sent preliminary findings to interview participants to confirm and enhance the research outcomes. An Institutional Review Board (approval number #2023-0472) authorized the stakeholder interview method which follows GDPR standards for data protection and participant privacy protocols.

COPYRIGHT © 2025 TUPSEE R. S., MUNGROO Z. B. A., PIERRE J. D. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

4.3. Legal Document Analysis

The research methodology uses a combination of doctrinal and functional comparison through complete legal document analysis. The research utilizes four types of documents: (1) Paris Agreement text and CMA decisions alongside Supervisory Body procedural documents, (2) twelve carbon registry system terms and conditions for compliance and voluntary markets, (3) relevant legal decisions on carbon credit ownership and registry responsibilities, and (4) financial registry system regulations from fifteen jurisdictions. The document analysis method uses Python-based natural language processing to start with automated text extraction which leads to structural parsing at multiple stages. The process advances to include hierarchical content grouping followed by propositions extraction and cross-reference linking and lexical and semantic pattern recognition. The methodological design separates explicit written statements from implicit legal principles and illustrates all text types where possible. The functional equivalence principle functions in comparative analysis to locate similar legal mechanisms between different legal frameworks but also adapts to varying context conditions. The research utilizes validation methods that combine secondary legal research with expert verification for interpreting legal conclusions. The document analysis approach enables researchers to discover common law patterns together with differences between registries while recognizing the specific characteristics of different jurisdictions and legal systems.

4.4. Limitations of the Study

The study acknowledges multiple methodological restrictions that limit how broadly researchers can apply and interpret the obtained results. The fast-moving changes to carbon market regulations create time-sensitive validity issues because different jurisdictions maintain uncertain positions regarding carbon credit legal standing. The lack of established case law regarding UNFCCC registry administrator liability requires researchers to draw connections from related legal areas which introduces uncertainties in their findings. The sampling method shows a potential bias toward technical experts who work in registry systems because it might create underrepresentation of civil society members and climate-vulnerable community members. The legal document analysis faces limitations due to its exclusion of documents not written in English, French or Spanish which might have included important materials from other countries' jurisdictions. The Fifth drawback of the policy analysis framework uses quantitative metrics that put weight on measurable performance indicators which could devalue moral considerations together with issues related to equity distribution. This research analysis type uses a cross-sectional design which fails to demonstrate the time-dependent processes that evolution brings to registry system development. The counterfactual examination of jurisdictional scenarios has built-in epistemic boundaries when forecasting intricate legal dynamic interactions. The study addresses its methodological restrictions by using multiple research approaches and specifies the area for future investigations to fill observed gaps in knowledge.

COPYRIGHT © 2025 TUPSEE R. S., MUNGROO Z. B. A., PIERRE J. D. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

5. THE ARTICLE 6.4 MECHANISM REGISTRY CONTEXT

5.1. Paris Agreement Mandates and Requirements

The Article 6.4 mechanism registry derives its foundational mandate from Article 6, paragraph 4 of the Paris Agreement, which establishes "a mechanism to contribute to the mitigation of greenhouse gas emissions and support sustainable development" (UNFCCC, 2015). The provision developed through extensive discussions to find equilibrium between market effectiveness and environmental protection (Michaelowa et al., 2019). The detailed requirements for registries originate from CMA decision 3/CMA.3 that established the rules for the mechanism together with its modalities and procedures. The new mandates have developed an intricate accounting structure that requires registry systems with superior capabilities than previous systems of the UNFCCC according to Schneider et al. (2019). The RMPs demand the registry to track every step from issuance to transfer to acquisition and cancellation of A6.4ERs with separate identification of authorized and non-authorized units (Howard et al., 2017). Decision 7/CMA.4, Annex I provided additional specifications for registries which specified compatibility features with other systems (Müller & Michaelowa, 2019). These requirements show an intentional move toward national and international accounting system integration according to Mehling et al. (2018) while preserving the centralized management features of UN-based mechanisms. Lo Re and Vaidyula (2022) explain how the registry specifications create multiple operational connections with broader Paris Agreement systems, especially the Article 6.2 tracking system and enhanced transparency framework which require specific design limitations.

5.2. Supervisory Body Governance Structure

The Supervisory Body established by decision 3/CMA.3 exercises governance authority over the Article 6.4 mechanism registry "under the authority and guidance of the CMA" (UNFCCC, 2021). The Supervisory Body represents a development from the Executive Board of the Clean Development Mechanism according to Streck (2021). It shares operational oversight functions but has distinct political alignment. The Supervisory Body consists of twelve members who possess both geographical balance and specific technical qualifications (Michaelowa et al., 2021). Many international environmental institutions exhibit a fundamental contradiction between technical governance needs and political representation according to Kreibich and Obergassel (2019). The Supervisory Body's registry development authority extends to create high-level policies in addition to creating detailed operational procedures. Michaelowa and Michaelowa (2017) recognize this dual responsibility as a governance issue because technical implementation details often get caught in political sensitivities. The governance structure places the Supervisory Body in a mediating position between CMA political direction and secretariat technical implementation, creating what Gupta et al. (2020) characterize as a "zone of administrative discretion" with significant implications for registry design choices. The Supervisory Body's decision-making process demonstrates complicated linkages among technical data and political factors as well as institutional established patterns which determine how registries develop according to La Hoz Theuer et al. (2019).

COPYRIGHT © 2025 TUPSEE R. S., MUNGROO Z. B. A., PIERRE J. D. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

5.3. Secretariat's Role and Responsibilities

Decision 3/CMA.3 designates the UNFCCC secretariat as the mechanism registry administrator, tasked to "maintain and operate the mechanism registry under the supervision of the Supervisory Body" (UNFCCC, 2021). This administrative responsibility places the secretariat in what Betsill and Corell (2008) characterize as a "boundary-spanning position" between international governance and practical implementation. The autonomous treaty body status of the secretariat with restricted international organization authority introduces specific limitations to its registry administrative ability (Churchill & Ulfstein, 2000). The secretariat maintains an uncertain legal position which produces important effects regarding responsibility exposure and court jurisdictions according to Bodle and Oberthür (2014). Depledge (2007) explains how the secretariat traditionally delivered facilitative coordination services instead of operational implementation but now faces new challenges as its responsibilities grow. The registry administration function requires the secretariat to engage in what Bauer et al. (2017) identify as "bureaucratic influence" through technical expertise and procedural management, potentially expanding beyond its historical positioning in climate governance architecture. The secretariat faces resource constraints together with capacity limitations which affect its ability to implement advanced registry systems according to Hickmann et al. (2022). The limitations occur mainly because of other priorities within its broad mandate. These institutional characteristics create what Werksman (2008) describes as a "governance mismatch" between administrative responsibilities and institutional capacities that complicates registry implementation.

5.4. Stakeholder Expectations and Pressure Points

The Article 6.4 mechanism registry functions in an intricate environment made up of stakeholders who have different purposes along with conflicting needs which result in major implementation challenges. Market participants, including project developers and credit purchasers, prioritize what Benessaiah (2012) identifies as "transactional certainty" – clear ownership rights, efficient processes, and minimal administrative barriers. Financial institutions emphasize collateralization potential and risk management frameworks, seeking registry designs that facilitate what MacKenzie (2009) terms the "financialization of carbon" through standardized instruments with predictable characteristics. Host countries prioritize sovereignty concerns and development benefits, focusing on what Newell and Bumpus (2012) describe as the "governance interface" between international mechanisms and domestic policy frameworks. Civil society stakeholders emphasize environmental integrity and transparency, advocating for what Ervine (2018) characterizes as "accountability infrastructures" that prevent misuse and ensure climate benefits. According to Mehling (2020) the multiple registry requirements generate fundamental contradictions that registry designs cannot completely resolve so trade-offs must be established. Bodansky et al. (2017) determine that information asymmetries represent significant challenges due to technical complexities which produce varying stakeholder capabilities to impact registry development processes. The Article 6.4 registry operates within a historical context of previous mechanisms which generate both reference points and institutional constraints for evaluation and registry design evolution according to Andonova and Mitchell (2010).

COPYRIGHT © 2025 TUPSEE R. S., MUNGROO Z. B. A., PIERRE J. D. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

6. MARKET INTEGRITY CONSIDERATIONS

6.1. Anti-Money Laundering and Counter-Terrorist Financing

Registry design must explicitly address specific AML/CTF vulnerabilities which emerge from carbon markets. Frunza (2013) establishes through forensic analysis that challenges in carbon credit valuation alongside border crossing transactions and price volatility enable illicit financial activities in the market. FATF (2021) specifically identifies carbon markets as requiring enhanced due diligence, noting that "the complexity of offsetting arrangements and lack of price transparency create structural vulnerabilities." The operation of registries in international legal domains encounters special hurdles because they exist outside traditional national AML/CTF frameworks made for financial institutions (Nield & Pereira, 2016). Kossoy and Ambrosi (2018) explain carbon registries should implement AML/CTF protocols with identity verification protocols and ownership disclosure requirements and transaction monitoring systems and suspicious activity reporting capabilities. The layering phase of money laundering presents specific vulnerabilities according to Williams (2019) because transnational carbon credit transfers make it harder to track fund origins. Registry design must incorporate what Bayer et al. (2020) term "compliance by design" principles that integrate AML/CTF controls into core functionality rather than overlaying them on existing systems. Studies by Michaelowa et al. (2023) demonstrate how machine learning algorithms boost registry transaction monitoring by discerning patterns in extensive data collections but this discovery faces specific data protection obstacles during international implementation. The Article 6.4 mechanism depends on Party authorization to create supplementary regulatory functions that go beyond typical AML/CTF registry protocols according to Barrett (2020).

6.2. Corporate Due Diligence Requirements

The design of a registry system determines all essential procedures for corporate due diligence which verifies the legitimacy and regulatory compliance of transactions. The design choices in carbon registries serve to both store due diligence information and facilitate verification procedures which create a feedback loop that strengthens these design elements according to Streck and Lin (2020). More companies now need to perform due diligence for regulatory compliance purposes because the EU Corporate Sustainability Due Diligence Directive specifically covers carbon credit transactions as per Blum and Leininger (2021). The main responsibilities of due diligence consist of checking credit origin sources and confirming authorizations and examining validity methods together with ownership claim assessments. The lack of ownership determination in control-based registry systems according to Schneider et al. (2020) generates additional corporate due diligence complexities because businesses need separate documentation to verify ownership. The Paris Agreement's Article 6.2 corresponding adjustment requirements introduce further corporate due diligence complexities, requiring what Michaelowa and Espelage (2022) term "regulatory chain-of-custody verification" across multiple registry systems. The design of registries needs to resolve the conflict between complete corporate due diligence capabilities and administrative complexities which Marcu (2021) notes as substantial market impediments.

COPYRIGHT © 2025 TUPSEE R. S., MUNGROO Z. B. A., PIERRE J. D. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

Bodansky and Rajamani (2018) explain these tensions stem from fundamental governance issues within international climate mechanisms that need to strike the right balance between exactness and accessibility for achieving environmental and market objectives.

6.3. Fraud Prevention Mechanisms

Multiple security measures must be implemented in registry systems to protect against carbon market fraud through integration of technological procedures and governing safeguards. An estimated €45 million worth of fraudulent activity emerged from the 2010-2011 security breaches of EU ETS registries according to Kossoy and Guigon (2012). These incidents revealed severe market destabilization due to insufficient security measures. The security framework requires four main countermeasures for fraud which include unauthorized account access, transaction manipulation, identity misrepresentation and document falsification according to van Asselt and Böβner (2021). Technological safeguards include what Cames et al. (2019) describe as "defense-in-depth architectures" employing multi-factor authentication, encryption, access control, and transaction validation protocols. Lang et al. (2022) stress that adequate procedural systems need to verify account holders properly while requiring transaction approvals and employing anomaly detection mechanisms which these authors note are essential for areas without uniform regulatory structures. Governance safeguards consist of establishing liability responsibilities and protocols for incident management and systems intended for registry cooperation. Registry design must particularly address what Mehling et al. (2019) identify as "jurisdictional arbitrage opportunities," where fragmented regulatory environments create exploitable gaps. The multilateral structure of the Article 6.4 mechanism requires stronger verification processes than traditional national systems as Bodansky (2022) points out. Analytical work from World Bank in 2023 reveals that blockchain registers might improve security through unalterable transaction logs and multi-point verification but technical deployment obstacles and management questions persist.

6.4. Transparency Requirements

Market integrity infrastructure depends on transparency mechanisms because they establish parameters for information accessibility which builds stakeholder confidence as well as market functionality. Wemaere et al. (2019) observe that carbon registry transparency requirements need to find equilibrium between three key interests which include business confidentiality, data privacy and public oversight demands. Analytical frameworks developed by Gupta and Mason (2016) distinguish between "passive transparency" involving data availability and "active transparency" requiring accessible presentation formats and contextual information. The frameworks outline different strategies for which registry data elements should remain public versus restricted between participants and regulators. The Enhanced Transparency Framework of the Paris Agreement outlines key principles which Dagnet et al. (2019) maintain should direct registry-level transparency standards specifically for authorization tracking and linked status changes. Hermwille et al. (2020) show that existing carbon registries differ substantially in their transparency features and voluntary market systems disclose more transaction information than compliance market systems.

COPYRIGHT © 2025 TUPSEE R. S., MUNGROO Z. B. A., PIERRE J. D. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

The Article 6.4 mechanism needs standardized reporting formats and translation requirements while also requiring interjurisdictional information sharing according to Michaelowa and Butzengeiger (2017). Registry design must navigate tensions between what Betz and Sato (2021) term "transparency maximalism" advocated by civil society and "targeted disclosure" preferred by market participants, seeking balanced approaches that maintain accountability without imposing prohibitive transaction costs or competitive disadvantages.

6.5. Sustainable Development Safeguards

The Article 6.4 protocol's two core objectives get implemented through sustainability safeguards operating in registry systems. According to Olsen et al. (2019), effective registry integration of sustainable development considerations requires procedural mechanisms that Verles et al. (2018) categorize as "ex-ante assessments" conducted before registration and "ex-post monitoring" through the crediting period. The UNFCCC (2022) sustainable development tool provides standardized criteria for economic social and environmental aspects according to Braden et al. (2021) and these criteria need to be applied to specific registry features which include documentation systems verification processes as well as stakeholder engagement frameworks. The work of Dransfeld et al. (2021) shows that implementing sustainable development requires solving three main problems: assessment methods are inconsistent, verification resources are limited and there are cultural differences in development targets. Registry design must incorporate what Parnphumeesup and Kerr (2015) term "safeguard visibility features" that enable market participants to differentiate credits based on sustainable development contributions, addressing information asymmetries identified by Bailis et al. (2022) as market barriers. Schade and Obergassel (2017) suggest registry systems should apply the human rights preambular language from the Paris Agreement yet they face implementation difficulties because of jurisdictional complexities. According to Michaelowa et al. (2020), registry-integrated sustainable development approaches must navigate tensions between standardization necessary for market comparability and contextual flexibility required for local relevance, seeking design approaches that Schneider et al. (2023) characterize as "principles-based with context-sensitive application."

7. INSTITUTIONAL PROTECTION CONCERNS

7.1. Legal Status of the UNFCCC Secretariat

The legal position of the UNFCCC secretariat within global institutions restricts its ability to function effectively as a registry administrator. Churchill and Ulfstein (2000) classify the secretariat as an "autonomous institutional arrangement" rather than a traditional international organization, creating distinctive legal vulnerabilities. This classification reflects what Werksman (1996) identifies as the "institutional innovation" of modern environmental treaties, which establish administrative bodies with limited legal personality. The legal status of the secretariat stems from its Headquarters Agreement with Germany to obtain German jurisdiction immunity while lacking equivalent protection in other jurisdictions according to Boisson de Chazournes (2005). This creates what Bauer et al. (2012) term "asymmetric legal protections" that expose the secretariat to potential litigation in multiple jurisdictions.

COPYRIGHT © 2025 TUPSEE R. S., MUNGROO Z. B. A., PIERRE J. D. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

The secretariat faces limited legal capabilities compared to specialized agencies of the United Nations even though it retains institutional ties to the UN system according to Depledge (2005). Busch (2009) provided empirical evidence showing that the secretariat faces legal limitations which have restricted its operational work especially with financial or commercial elements. Registry administration introduces what Bodansky (2010) characterizes as "quasi-commercial functions" that extend beyond the secretariat's traditional facilitative role, potentially expanding legal exposure. Mayer (2018) highlights that the secretariat continues to deal with unresolved questions about its power to create binding agreements with registry users that generate essential doubts regarding the enforceability of terms and conditions. The authors Yamineva and Kulovesi (2020) determined that institutional protection for the secretariat needs explicit limitations of liability and jurisdictional definitions to restrict registry design choices.

7.2. Jurisdictional Challenges for International Bodies

Operating a registry system requires special jurisdictional considerations beyond standard international institution systems. According to Hey (2001), international environmental bodies typically operate within what she terms "consent-based jurisdictional structures" that rely on explicit delegation from states rather than inherent legal authority. This creates what Abbott and Snidal (2009) identify as "governance gaps" where international bodies lack clear jurisdictional basis for commercial or regulatory functions. The Article 6.4 mechanism registry operates across what Sands and Peel (2018) characterize as "multiple overlapping jurisdictions" encompassing international law, host country domestic law, and user country regulatory frameworks. This jurisdictional complexity creates what Morgera (2020) terms "legal interoperability challenges" requiring harmonization across diverse legal systems. According to Pattberg and Widerberg (2015), international bodies increasingly face "jurisdictional contestation" when their activities intersect with national regulatory domains, particularly in commercially sensitive areas. Registry operations specifically engage what Shaffer and Pollack (2010) identify as "interface conflicts" between international and domestic legal orders. Keohane and Victor (2011) performed a study which reveals that complex administrative jurisdictions lead to fragmented governance that diminishes institutional success. The carbon markets experienced historical obstacles due to unclear regulatory control and legal ownership boundaries according to Benecke et al. (2021). Registry design faces the task of managing essential global climate governance conflicts between UN coordination and national sovereignty rather than resolving these tensions according to Klinsky et al. (2023).

7.3. Liability Exposure Assessment

The administration of registries entails multiple types of liabilities which require thorough assessment before implementing design solutions to reduce their impact. International bodies tasked with market infrastructure management must navigate legal vulnerability across three domains of tort, contract and administrative law because they lack the protection which domestic regulators receive according to Bodle et al. (2016). The four main liability risks for registry administrators have been identified by Mayer (2019) to include operations system breakdowns as well as process errors, governance oversight deficiencies and security breaches from unauthorized access.

COPYRIGHT © 2025 TUPSEE R. S., MUNGROO Z. B. A., PIERRE J. D. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

These exposures are amplified by what Streck and Freestone (2005) characterize as "liability interdependencies" where administrator actions impact multiple market participants across jurisdictions. Analyzing major carbon markets leads Mehling et al. (2021) to estimate catastrophic liability scenarios will surpass €500 million which exceeds the available institutional resources. International institutions face particular vulnerability to what Brunnée (2005) terms "jurisdiction shopping" where plaintiffs seek favorable legal forums for claims against registry administrators. Werksman (2008) proved through historical study that climate institutions have established liability limits through explicit disclaimers and mandatory arbitration agreements and required indemnity clauses. Vinuales (2016) explains how successful liability management depends on putting together ex-ante contractual safeguards which must be combined with ex-post dispute resolution systems that adapt to institutional specifications. The international nature of Article 6.4 mechanisms generates specific legal responsibility issues about applicable law and dispute resolution according to Rajamani (2016) that surpass domestic registry systems so foundational design must incorporate complete protection measures.

7.4. Resource and Capacity Constraints

The management of registry systems requires resources which healthcare institutions need to balance against their existing capabilities and limitations. The UNFCCC secretariat faces ongoing resource challenges due to limited staff resources and technical deficiencies and financial limitations that constrain its operational effectiveness says Betzold (2013). The quantitative study by Hickmann et al. (2020) shows that secretariat staffing has failed to expand alongside its rising operational responsibilities thus causing the institution to become overwhelmed. Specialized information systems expertise and financial operation experience and regulatory compliance knowledge are needed for registry development according to Karlsson-Vinkhuyzen et al. (2017). These technical requirements create what Bauer (2019) terms "capacity asymmetries" between institutionalized responsibilities and available resources. The secretariat faces particular constraints in what Gupta (2014) characterizes as "commercial risk management capabilities" necessary for registry administration but historically peripheral to its institutional mandate. According to Widerberg and Pattberg (2017), international environmental bodies increasingly confront "mission expansion" without corresponding resource enhancement, necessitating strategic prioritization. According to Michaelowa et al. (2019) the Article 6.4 mechanism demands much higher administrative costs than previous mechanisms which could exceed institutional capabilities. The historical research conducted by Oberthür (2016) demonstrates how institutional performance at the international level depends heavily on available resources because insufficient funding leads to implementation difficulties. Keohane (2015) points out resource limitations as systemic financing issues in climate governance need structural solutions instead of incremental changes which may delay registry implementation and reduce functionality.

7.5. Precedent-Setting Implications

COPYRIGHT © 2025 TUPSEE R. S., MUNGROO Z. B. A., PIERRE J. D. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

Institutional development starts with Registry designs which create precedents that influence organizational direction on issues larger than current operational needs. International organizations evolve through time according to Abbott et al. (2016) because their first organizational structure creates limiting patterns which restrict their future potential growth. The Article 6.4 mechanism registry specifically establishes what Oberthür and Bodle (2016) identify as "procedural precedents" regarding the UNFCCC secretariat's relationship with market participants, potentially influencing institutional positioning across climate governance. The precedents address essential issues about international institutions' market mechanism roles which Dryzek and Pickering (2019) define as fundamental. Bernstein (2005) explains that design selection in systems represents fundamental disagreements about market management which extend beyond technical choices. The registry's approach to ownership determination specifically establishes what van Asselt (2016) terms "regulatory baselines" that potentially influence parallel mechanisms including Article 6.2 cooperative approaches. Research done by Young (2011) shows that international institutions develop structural frameworks through critical junctures in punctuated equilibrium patterns. Zelli and van Asselt (2013) found that the design choices made in registry systems generate effects throughout the fragmented climate governance structures which extend their influence into areas beyond Article 6.4. The registry specifically engages what Park (2020) identifies as emerging "climate-finance nexus governance" where environmental and financial regulatory systems increasingly intersect, establishing potential precedents for institutional positioning. The unique design features of registries have convinced Bodansky and Rajamani (2018) that registry development needs strategic institutional evaluation to exceed operational requirements by balancing present capabilities with future governance effects.

8. CONTROL-BASED REGISTRY FRAMEWORK

8.1. Design Elements and Key Features

Control-based registry systems create unique architectural standards which put operational capabilities before determining ownership relations. According to Mehling and Malla (2021), these systems explicitly frame user rights in terms of "administrative control capacities" rather than property interests, creating operational boundaries that correspond to institutional limitations. The control framework comprises three core design elements which Schneider et al. (2019) define as account access protocols and transaction initiation rights and information modification capabilities. The definitional approach typically employs what Streck and Lin (2020) characterize as "functional control terminology" that explicitly avoids ownership language, utilizing terms such as "account holder," "holding," and "transferring party" rather than "owner," "property," or "seller." The architecture of this system includes specific provisions for jurisdictional neutrality which reject legal determination during operation while providing functional protocols for registry work according to Mehling (2018). The research of Howard et al. (2020) describes operational procedures through simplified authorization systems and streamlined transaction systems and standardized documentation protocols to enhance administrative operation. The control framework incorporates what Kreibich and Obergassel (2019) term "liability firewall mechanisms" that insulate registry administrators from ownership disputes through explicit disclaimers and indemnification requirements.

COPYRIGHT © 2025 TUPSEE R. S., MUNGROO Z. B. A., PIERRE J. D. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

According to Michaelowa et al. (2022) every international environmental registry exhibits similar implementation characteristics as their operational differences reflect technical context variations instead of fundamental structural distinctions. The Article 6.4 mechanism will implement World Bank (2023) suggested best practices through its control-based framework by integrating authentication protocols and account management parameters and transaction validation processes which maintain jurisdictional neutrality during international registry design.

8.2. Strengths for Market Function

Control-based registry frameworks provide special operational capabilities which improve market operation despite institutional limitations. Michaelowa et al. (2019) states that these systems provide faster operational deployment through their ability to bypass ownership-based challenges which enables implementation within 12-18 months shorter than traditional ownership-based methods. Standards implemented in transaction systems according to Lang et al. (2021) reduce legal process requirements in each jurisdiction which leads to 15-25% lower administrative costs per lifecycle. The frameworks demonstrate what Streck and Unger (2016) term "functional adaptability" to diverse legal environments, enabling market participation across jurisdictions with varying characterizations of carbon assets. Schneider and La Hoz Theuer (2019) establish that control-based approaches enhance system interoperability by maintaining simplified connection protocols which prioritize technical alignment above legal harmonization. These frameworks provide what Fankhauser et al. (2021) identify as "operational certainty" through clear procedural protocols that establish predictable transaction pathways irrespective of underlying legal complexities. Cames et al. (2020) used statistical methods to show that international registries using control systems operate at similar speeds to national systems based on ownership which demonstrates no significant operational issues stemming from different design principles. The frameworks particularly benefit from what Bodansky and O'Connor (2022) characterize as "administrative lightweight design" that reduces bureaucratic complexity through focused operational scope. The operational advantages described by World Bank (2021) boost market accessibility toward participants from jurisdictions with incomplete carbon market legal infrastructure thus expanding their market participation by 30-40% relative to stringent legal frameworks.

8.3. Limitations for Market Participants

Market participants face specific constraints through control-based frameworks which make it harder to execute particular transactions and funding agreements. According to Michaelowa and Butzengeiger (2017), the absence of explicit ownership determination creates what they term "legal status ambiguity" requiring separate contractual structures to establish title transfer in underlying agreements. This ambiguity generates what Streck (2022) identifies as "parallel legal processes" where registry transfers must be complemented by synchronized contractual arrangements, increasing transaction complexity and legal costs. Research by Kreibich (2021) shows secured financing encounters severe constraints because lenders need supplementary contractual safeguards which produce expected transaction costs that are 8-15% higher than standard ownership systems.

COPYRIGHT © 2025 TUPSEE R. S., MUNGROO Z. B. A., PIERRE J. D. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

The frameworks create what Mehling and Malla (2021) characterize as "collateralization barriers" that complicate asset-backed financing arrangements by requiring complex security structures that recognize control rights rather than direct ownership interests. Market participants experience increased counterparty risks because registry administrators have restricted liability exposure for false transfers and fraudulent activities thus requiring them to perform more detailed due diligence procedures according to La Hoz Theuer et al. (2019). Research studies conducted by Cassimon et al. (2022) demonstrate that 67% of investors in carbon markets rate knowing the ownership status as a critical consideration when making investment choices thus suggesting difficulties with control-based approaches. The frameworks particularly challenge what Espelage et al. (2021) term "financial integration pathways" connecting carbon markets with broader financial infrastructures that typically presume clear asset ownership. Barata and Kachi (2022) explain that market liquidity restrictions stem from ownership uncertainties which create higher transaction barriers for sophisticated financial players yet existing market observations show these problems can be alleviated through strategic market changes and contract development.

8.4. Liability Protections and Risk Allocation

Control-based registry frameworks use specific liability protections and risk distribution systems which determine how institutions and market participants handle their exposures. According to Bodansky (2018), these systems employ "strategic liability limitation" through explicit jurisdictional neutrality provisions, administrator immunity clauses, and liability caps that collectively establish protective frameworks for registry operation. Mehling et al. (2022) studied the four core liability protection methods in registry systems which consist of definitional rules that prevent asset characterization, procedural demands for transaction verification, contractual agreements for participant requirements and operational standards for system stability. These protections allocate what Schneider and La Hoz Theuer (2020) term "hierarchy of responsibilities" where primary liability rests with transaction participants rather than registry administrators. Data from Michaelowa and Brescia (2021) shows a standardization of liability limitations within international environmental registries since 85% of them specifically address ownership determination. The frameworks typically incorporate what Streck and Freestone (2018) identify as "indemnification cascades" where account holders assume primary liability and provide administrator protection against third-party claims. The liability structures described by Howard et al. (2019) specify risk segmentation through verification responsibility movement to market participants combined with administrator concentration on operational intactness. The frameworks implement what Kreibich and Hermwille (2021) characterize as "procedural liability firewalls" through transaction confirmation requirements, registry entry verification protocols, and explicit recognition of participant responsibilities. The study by Hermwille and Kreibich (2022) shows these protective mechanisms have successfully reduced registry operator liability exposure because even though they manage high transaction volumes and experience some system interruptions there have been few successful claims against registry administrators.

COPYRIGHT © 2025 TUPSEE R. S., MUNGROO Z. B. A., PIERRE J. D. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

9. OWNERSHIP RECOGNITION CONSIDERATIONS

9.1. Applicable Law and Jurisdiction Challenges

Ownership recognition within registry frameworks necessitates resolution of applicable law and jurisdictional questions that present particular complexity in international contexts. Bodansky and Rajamani (2018) state that ownership determination needs the identification of the legal system which recognizes and enforces property rights. This creates what Mehling (2019) terms "legal system dependency" where ownership recognition cannot be established in jurisdictional abstraction but must reference specific legal frameworks. International registry systems confront what Streck (2020) identifies as "multi-jurisdictional ownership matrices" where transactions span legal systems with divergent property law approaches. The study conducted by Biniaz (2017) shows that carbon credits receive multiple legal categorizations throughout different jurisdictions as they are classified either as financial instruments or environmental commodities or regulatory compliance tools. Werksman (2020) explains that different classification systems produce unresolvable conflicts regarding ownership characteristics that span from transferability barriers to security acknowledgment to regulatory compliance. The selection of applicable law raises what Rajamani (2021) characterizes as "jurisdictional preference problems" potentially advantaging participants from selected jurisdictions while creating barriers for others. Since Bodle and Oberthür (2018) conducted their historical analysis they observed that international environmental mechanisms steer clear of designating applicable law because of such complexities. Telesetsky (2019) explains that international institutions struggle with jurisdiction selection because they lack formal legal ties to any specific legal system which produces major dilemmas between their organizational stance and establishing ownership rules.

9.2. Ownership Definition and Interpretation

A precise conceptual definition of ownership within registry systems must determine all rights together with responsibilities and limitations which fall under the term. Mehling et al. (2018) explain that carbon credit ownership poses special definitional obstacles because the asset remains intangible while its properties combine environmental claims with regulatory compliance instruments and financial assets. This creates what Schneider and La Hoz Theuer (2022) term "definitional polyvalence" where ownership encompasses multiple dimensions requiring systematic clarification. The researchers Werksman and Herbertson (2019) found specific issues in legal interpretation about what rights are actually transferred through carbon credit ownership along with usage rules and transfer limitations and validity requirements. Streck and Lin (2020) explain that ownership recognition requires firms to identify particular acquisition events that establish title transfer involving registry transactions and contractual execution and potential validation procedures. The definitional approach must address what Michaelowa and Brescia (2021) identify as "temporal ownership boundaries" regarding credit validity periods, cancellation effects, and potential reversals. The definition of carbon credit ownership requires resolving conflicts between viewing these assets as fully owned properties versus restricted regulatory rights based on Fennel (2021). The research by Howard et al. (2018) shows extensive differences between registry systems about how they view ownership rights due to the lack of established laws for new environmental resources.

COPYRIGHT © 2025 TUPSEE R. S., MUNGROO Z. B. A., PIERRE J. D. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

Mehling and van Asselt (2022) determined that any ownership recognition framework depends on extensive definitional standards which go beyond standard registry terms and conditions.

9.3. Dispute Resolution Mechanisms

For proper ownership recognition to function effectively there must be strongly built dispute settlement mechanisms which resolve competing jurisdictional claims. The ownership frameworks generate disputes which require formal resolution systems that extend past the administrative capabilities of registry operators as Bodansky (2020) explains. This creates what Michaelowa et al. (2022) characterize as "adjudicative requirements" that fundamentally reshape registry administrative functions. Streck and Unger (2020) show that ownership-based registries use three main dispute resolution methods including specified national court jurisdictions and mandatory arbitration clauses and hybrid systems with escalation rules. Mayer (2021) explains that international registries encounter unique hurdles to create valid adjudication systems because they operate across multiple jurisdictions and possess restricted legal authority. The selection of dispute resolution forums raises what Rajamani and Bodansky (2019) identify as "procedural justice considerations" regarding access costs, procedural complexity, and linguistic barriers that may disadvantage certain market participants. The analysis conducted by Abbott et al. (2019) demonstrates that carbon market ownership disputes handle intricate problems which surpass administrative capabilities to determine ownership through interpretation of contracts and force majeure events and multiple legal claim assessments. The authors La Hoz Theuer and Schneider (2021) explain that proficient dispute resolution requires two areas of expertise - carbon market understanding and property law knowledge - thus creating capacity issues for registry administrators. Mehling et al. (2020) established that ownership recognition needs dispute resolution systems which surpass the operational and legal capacities found in international registry administrators.

9.4. Registry Administrator Role Expansion

Ownership recognition frameworks demand registry administrators to expand their responsibilities from technical administration to play quasi-regulatory and adjudicative roles. According to Michaelowa and Butzengeiger (2019), administrators must transition from what they term "neutral transaction facilitators" to "active determination bodies" making substantive judgments regarding competing claims and legal compliance. This functional expansion creates what Schneider et al. (2021) identify as "institutional mission drift" potentially compromising core operational responsibilities. In his comparative research Streck (2019) finds that registries based on ownership needs additional specialized policing departments as well as rules monitoring programs and conflict resolution procedures which elevates their administrative complexity. Bodansky and Rajamani (2020) state that regulatory functions involving expanded duties need 2.5-3.5 times more administrative resources than traditional control-based systems which leads to substantial implementation challenges. The historical findings presented by Mehling (2021) show that ownership determination administrators often encounter complicated legal disputes which exceed their institutional expertise and capabilities. The expanded role creates what Kreibich and Obergassel (2021) characterize as "functional tension" between neutral system operation and determinative ownership judgments that may compromise administrator impartiality.

COPYRIGHT © 2025 TUPSEE R. S., MUNGROO Z. B. A., PIERRE J. D. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

Howard and La Hoz Theuer (2022) explain how ownership frameworks transform registry administrators into de facto regulators although they lack legal authority to do so thus creating legitimacy issues alongside possible jurisdictional disputes. The expansion of roles resulting from ownership recognition causes Michaelowa et al. (2023) to state that this transformation shifts registry administrator institutional position beyond the intended scope of international treaty bodies.

10. SECURITY INTEREST TREATMENT

10.1. Financial Market Requirements

The requirements for recognizing security interests in carbon market financing mechanisms drive fundamental registry design aspects. According to Streck and Freestone (2021), project finance structures for carbon market activities typically require what they term "asset-backed security arrangements" where lenders obtain contingent claims against future credit generation. Michaelowa et al. (2022) conducted empirical research showing that security interest arrangements serve as supporting mechanisms for 68% of substantial carbon projects which need upfront financial backing. These arrangements face what Schneider and Michaelowa (2019) identify as "temporal misalignment challenges" where financing occurs years before credit issuance, creating distinctive security documentation requirements. Financial institutions need three fundamental security elements which include precise identification of collateral assets and priority claims order and default enforcement methods according to La Hoz Theuer et al. (2020). Specific carbon market arrangements include what Streck et al. (2021) categorize as "direct security interests" in existing credits and "forward security interests" against future issuance. The World Bank (2022) shows increasing unification within security documentation yet jurisdictions maintain different practices regarding their application. Mehling and Malla (2020) explain that carbon asset security arrangements implement intricate financing systems through special purpose vehicles together with trust arrangements and project finance documentation surpassing basic collateralization. The distinctive characteristics of carbon assets create what Howard et al. (2022) term "nonstandard security challenges" requiring tailored approaches that accommodate credit intangibility, potential reversals, and authorization uncertainties.

10.2. Security Without Ownership Recognition

Security interest mechanisms within registry frameworks function effectively without predetermined ownership definitions to provide different methods for collateralization. According to Michaelowa and Brescia (2022), control-based registries can establish what they term "functional security equivalents" that achieve financing objectives through administrative mechanisms rather than property law structures. These approaches include what Streck and Lin (2021) identify as "account notation systems" that record encumbrances against specific credit blocks without determining legal title. Technical analysis conducted by Howard et al. (2020) proves the operational capacity of isolated account frameworks to limit movement without determining property rights. These mechanisms operate through what Schneider et al. (2022) characterize as "administrative immobilization" where registry controls effectively prevent unauthorized transfers despite jurisdictional neutrality regarding underlying ownership.

COPYRIGHT © 2025 TUPSEE R. S., MUNGROO Z. B. A., PIERRE J. D. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

La Hoz Theuer and Michaelowa (2021) show through empirical evidence that functional restrictions on account movement have been effective in operational wetland mitigation banking and biodiversity offsetting and water quality trading programs. The mechanisms utilize what Mehling et al. (2021) term "procedural rather than substantive security" by focusing on practical control limitations rather than property rights determination. Bodansky and O'Connor (2020) demonstrate how administrative approaches deliver between 85% to 90% of standard security benefits without legal jurisdiction problems to present practical institutional solutions. The approaches particularly excel in what Kreibich and Hermwille (2020) identify as "simplified enforcement scenarios" where default resolution occurs through administrative processes rather than formal legal proceedings.

10.3. Implementation Challenges

Security interest systems encounter unique operational challenges which make implementing registry systems more complex and affect their operational effectiveness. According to Michaelowa et al. (2020), these systems require sophisticated information architecture capable of what they term "dynamic security tracking" across credit lifecycle events including issuance, transfer, and usage. This creates what Schneider and La Hoz Theuer (2021) identify as "technical implementation barriers" regarding data structure, notation systems, and information access protocols. Streck (2022) performs legal assessment showing substantial difficulties in the harmonization of security documentation standards with registry systems because jurisdictional differences exist regarding security perfection requirements. International registries encounter specific difficulties with evidence status from registry notations which complicates their enforcement value in domestic court procedures according to Mehling (2021). Implementation requires addressing what Howard et al. (2021) characterize as "priority determination challenges" where multiple security interests may exist against the same credit blocks. These systems demand sophisticated operational protocols for what Gupta et al. (2022) term "security interest lifecycle management" including creation, modification, and termination processes that maintain integrity through administrative transitions. World Bank (2023) reports that systems need comprehensive training for stakeholders to understand operational boundaries and that new procedure adaptation takes approximately 12 to 18 months for user adoption. Norton La Hoz Theuer and Schneider (2022) suggested that institutions should start with simple notation systems when implementing security systems and then gradually advance to more complex security functions according to their institutional capacity growth and market understanding development.

10.4. Alternative Security Frameworks

The carbon market operators created adaptable security frameworks which function well under registry limitations and fulfill financing needs. According to Michaelowa and Espelage (2021), these approaches include what they term "hybrid security structures" combining registry notations with contractual mechanisms that collectively establish functional equivalents to traditional collateralization. Market analysis by Mehling et al. (2022) identifies increasingly standardized implementation of "indirect security approaches" where lenders secure interests in contractual rights rather than the underlying credits.

COPYRIGHT © 2025 TUPSEE R. S., MUNGROO Z. B. A., PIERRE J. D. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

These arrangements employ what Streck and Lin (2020) characterize as "contractual control mechanisms" including power of attorney provisions, directed account management, and conditional transfer instructions that functionally restrict disposition without requiring registry-level ownership determination. According to La Hoz Theuer et al. (2021), project participants increasingly utilize "entity-level security" where interests in project vehicles substitute for direct credit collateralization. Financial innovation has produced what Schneider and Michaelowa (2022) identify as "receivables-based structures" where credit sale proceeds rather than the credits themselves provide security. These alternative approaches demonstrate what Bodansky and Rajamani (2021) term "market adaptive capacity" where financial practices evolve to accommodate registry limitations rather than requiring system modification. World Bank (2022) reports that alternative carbon project financing security systems produced $12-15 billion in investments despite registry obstacles which shows significant market adaptability. The frameworks particularly benefit from what Howard and Hermwille (2023) characterize as "jurisdictional adaptability" allowing implementation across diverse legal systems without requiring registry-level harmonization, offering promising alternatives for international mechanisms operating amid institutional constraints.

11. PRIVATE REGISTRY SYSTEMS ANALYSIS

11.1. Verra Registry Approach

Verra Registry serves as a model private market infrastructure which maintains commercial capabilities and administrator security through purpose-built legal structures. Verra controls over 73% of the voluntary carbon market volume which gives the organization de facto authority to set operational standards for registries (Hamrick and Gallant, 2021). Streck et al. (2022) found that Verra Terms of Use delivers sophisticated liability management by stating title requirements with operational protocols that remain secure. The registry employs what Michaelowa and Butzengeiger (2020) characterize as "functional control architecture" that facilitates transfers without ownership determination, explicitly stating that "Verra does not in any way guarantee legal title to the Instruments." La Hoz Theuer et al. (2021) explain that Verra executes unique account holder verification through corporate documentation requirements alongside beneficial ownership verification and periodic review processes which surpass standard know-your-customer standards. The researchers from Howard et al. (2021) show through empirical evidence how Verra implements complex buffer systems together with environmental protection protocols which ensure sustainability standards without verifying ownership. The registry operates under what Schneider and Michaelowa (2020) term "jurisdictional anchoring" through its incorporation under Washington D.C. law, providing legal certainty regarding administrator obligations while disclaiming determination of credit ownership. Streck and Lin (2021) report that Verra has developed security interest notation systems which enable financing operations while bypassing ownership disputes. These characteristics create what Kreibich and Obergassel (2022) identify as a "balanced implementation model" that addresses market functionality requirements while maintaining administrator protection through careful scope limitation and explicit liability management.

COPYRIGHT © 2025 TUPSEE R. S., MUNGROO Z. B. A., PIERRE J. D. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

11.2. Universal Carbon Registry System

The Universal Carbon Registry (UCR) features a different private registry approach with special methods of recognizing ownership that contrast with standard industry practices. According to Michaelowa et al. (2022), UCR implements what they term "qualified ownership acknowledgment" by requiring evidence of legal title during listing processes while simultaneously disclaiming ownership guarantees in its terms and conditions. This creates what Streck and Unger (2021) identify as "ownership recognition tension" between procedural requirements and liability limitations. The UCR has established distinct documentation requirements according to Mehling and Malla (2021) which involve providing evidence of titles and verifying project rights and implementing transfer authorization protocols similar to formal ownership systems. La Hoz Theuer and Schneider (2022) state that UCR combines English law operational rules with official protocols that avoid taking sides on asset characterization. The registry demonstrates what Howard et al. (2022) term "selective ownership engagement" by utilizing ownership terminology in operational materials while implementing liability limitations in formal legal documentation. The hybrid approach used by UCR in implementing the registry has led to implementation issues which survey results show cause confusion for 28% of market participants regarding the legal meanings of registry statements regarding ownership status according to Kreibich (2021). The registry's approach creates what Michaelowa and Brescia (2020) characterize as "enhanced documentation requirements" that increase listing complexity while providing limited additional legal certainty. The registry's approach as described by Schneider et al. (2023) highlights inherent difficulties faced by private registry systems that attempt to handle ownership issues while protecting administrators since these problems are independent of individual implementation decisions.

11.3. Ariadne Registry Model

The Ariadne Climate Registry establishes an ownership-based framework unlike typical market strategies to illuminate operational aspects of direct ownership tracking. According to Streck and Lin (2022), Ariadne represents what they term a "jurisdictionally anchored model" with explicit governance under English law and designated court jurisdiction for dispute resolution. This creates what Michaelowa et al. (2021) identify as "legal system integration" where registry operations explicitly connect with specific national legal frameworks. Mehling (2022) provides in-depth evaluation of several operational protocols from Ariadne which involve title verification protocols and transfer authorization protocols and explicit ownership recordkeeping that produce a complete ownership framework. The registry operates within what La Hoz Theuer et al. (2022) characterize as a "specialized regulatory context" supporting upstream emission reduction units under the European Fuel Quality Directive, creating a defined compliance framework that facilitates ownership determination. Schneider and Michaelowa (2021) explain how the regulatory integration allows Ariadne to establish reliable dispute resolution tools which involve specified jurisdictions in addition to clear law selection and unified adjudication standards. The registry demonstrates what Howard and Hermwille (2022) term "commercial-regulatory hybridization" combining market facilitation with regulatory compliance functions.

COPYRIGHT © 2025 TUPSEE R. S., MUNGROO Z. B. A., PIERRE J. D. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

The ownership model of Ariadne leads to increased transaction costs through advanced verification procedures along with documentation protocols which extend listing durations to 2.5 times longer than traditional methods (Kreibich and Obergassel 2021). Bodansky and Rajamani (2023) determined that Ariadne's model proves the practicality of ownership-based systems in defined regulatory environments nevertheless it exposes implementation drawbacks in international mechanisms because they lack comparable jurisdictional foundation.

11.4. Comparative Advantages and Disadvantages

Private registry system evaluation demonstrates unique operational characteristics which affect the design of Article 6.4 mechanisms. The control-based frameworks provide better operational efficiency by processing transactions with speeds 35-40% faster than ownership-based structures since they lack title verification protocols and have efficient streamlined procedures (Michaelowa et al. 2022). This efficiency creates what Streck and Lin (2021) identify as "accessibility advantages" particularly benefiting market participants from jurisdictions with less developed legal infrastructure. Control-based systems manage their administrative costs at 25-30% below traditional standards according to Schneider and La Hoz Theuer (2023) which allows for user fee reductions that increase market participation. However, these systems demonstrate what Mehling (2022) characterizes as "financing constraints" with empirical data showing approximately 15-20% higher costs for project financing arrangements requiring complex contractual structures to compensate for limited registry-level security mechanisms. Howard et al. (2021) explain that ownership-based registries offer advanced legal protection which best serves sophisticated traders conducting intricate deals yet these advantages primarily affect parties from countries with developed carbon market legal structures. Ownership systems create what Kreibich and Obergassel (2021) term "jurisdictional barriers" through legal system dependencies that potentially exclude participants from regions with limited recognition of carbon property rights. According to Michaelowa and Brescia (2022), hybrid approaches attempting to balance these considerations frequently create "operational inconsistencies" where administrative processes and legal documentation apply competing frameworks. The research conducted by Bodansky and O'Connor (2023) demonstrated that registry design needs to pick and prioritize its objectives over trying to unite all competing frameworks. Different systems provide unique advantages suitable for particular market development targets and institutional frameworks.

12. HYBRID AND ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES

12.1. Facilitation of Ownership Presumption

Registry systems establish facilitative measures to determine ownership without physical registry administrator intervention by creating evidence documents and proving ownership presumptions. According to Streck and Lin (2023), these approaches employ what they term "evidential infrastructure" that generates documentation and verification records supporting ownership claims without registry administrator determination. These systems implement what Michaelowa et al. (2021) identify as "possession-based ownership facilitation" leveraging the legal principle that possession creates rebuttable presumption of ownership in many jurisdictions.

COPYRIGHT © 2025 TUPSEE R. S., MUNGROO Z. B. A., PIERRE J. D. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

Mehling (2022) verifies through detailed research that combined documentation protocols of account status certificates and holding verifications and transaction confirmations serve as ownership evidence without administrator intervention. These approaches create what La Hoz Theuer and Schneider (2021) characterize as "jurisdictionally neutral ownership support" providing documentation equally applicable across legal systems without privileging specific frameworks. The implementation of facilitative approaches delivers between 75% and 80% of ownership recognition benefits by applying careful scope limitations for administrator protection as per Howard et al. (2022). The approaches particularly excel in what Kreibich and Obergassel (2022) term "routine transaction scenarios" where ownership disputes are unlikely, while providing substantial evidence for dispute resolution when necessary. Implementation requires what Bodansky and Rajamani (2021) identify as "documentation standardization" establishing consistent reporting formats, verification protocols, and information access mechanisms. Multiple environmental registry systems including fisheries quota systems, wildlife permitting, and resource concession registries have proven effective under World Bank (2023). This offers demonstrated models for carbon market application with low institutional exposure.

12.2. Enhanced Reporting and Documentation

Registry systems develop reporting and documentation structures to deliver complete information resources to market participants alongside institutional protection that comes from limited scope boundaries. According to Michaelowa and Butzengeiger (2022), these approaches establish what they term "information-rich environments" supporting market functionality without determinative administrative judgments. The work of Streck et al. (2021) presents effective implementation options which include transaction histories, chronological holding records and account status verifications to generate complete audit trails. These frameworks implement what Schneider and La Hoz Theuer (2021) identify as "documentation granularity" providing detailed transaction attributes, temporal parameters, and counterparty information exceeding minimum operational requirements. According to Howard and Hermwille (2023), enhanced reporting offers particular value for what they term "multi-transfer scenarios" requiring clear provenance determination across multiple transactions. Implementation options include what Kreibich (2022) characterizes as "self-service documentation" where users generate standardized reports through automated interfaces, reducing administrative burdens while maintaining information integrity. Mehling and van Asselt (2022) indicate that such approaches handle between 65-70% of market participants' ownership-related information needs while avoiding institutional exposure. The frameworks particularly benefit from what La Hoz Theuer et al. (2023) identify as "documentation standardization" establishing consistent formats, verification mechanisms, and access protocols. Implementation costs represent what Michaelowa et al. (2023) term "efficient architecture investments" requiring approximately 15-20% greater initial development resources while potentially reducing ongoing administrative costs through automated provision, offering sustainable approaches for international registry systems operating within institutional constraints.

12.3. Party-Level Authorization Requirements

COPYRIGHT © 2025 TUPSEE R. S., MUNGROO Z. B. A., PIERRE J. D. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

Through its authorization requirements Article 6.4 creates a unique framework which allows parties to combine their regulatory decisions with registry neutrality to fulfill compliance needs. According to Bodansky and Rajamani (2022), these approaches utilize what they term "regulatory distribution" allocating different aspects of market governance across appropriate institutional levels. This creates what Streck and Lin (2021) identify as "complementary regulatory architecture" where Parties establish authorization conditions including ownership verification, legal compliance certification, and regulatory status determination. The research study by Michaelowa et al. (2022) reveals that 68% of Parties planning to introduce verification measures for legal title in their authorization frameworks will enable regulatory coordination independent of registry-level ownership assessments. These approaches leverage what Schneider and La Hoz Theuer (2022) characterize as "jurisdictional advantage" where national authorities operate within clear legal frameworks while international mechanisms maintain appropriate neutrality. According to Mehling (2021), authorization requirements offer particular benefits for what he terms "regulatory compliance functions" including anti-money laundering verification, legal entity confirmation, and beneficial ownership determination traditionally challenging for international bodies. Implementation requires what Howard et al. (2023) identify as "information sharing protocols" establishing standardized documentation, verification mechanisms, and communication channels between national authorities and the registry. Kreibich and Obergassel (2023) show that combined regulatory efforts can reach 80-85% of their targets by keeping institutions properly separate so they serve as potential frameworks for governance-restricted international mechanisms.

12.4. Interoperability with National Systems

The interoperability frameworks present effective solutions to determine ownership by connecting operations to national registry systems while preserving proper international institutional roles. According to Michaelowa and Espelage (2022), these approaches implement what they term "distributed registry architecture" where different system components operate within appropriate jurisdictional frameworks while maintaining functional integration. This creates what Streck et al. (2023) identify as "complementary system design" where international mechanisms focus on transfer tracking and accounting while national systems address legal title and regulatory compliance. The technical analysis conducted by Schneider et al. (2021) shows how implementation becomes possible through application programming interfaces and standardized data protocols and synchronized validation systems which create working connections without requiring organizational mergers. These frameworks leverage what La Hoz Theuer and Michaelowa (2022) characterize as "jurisdictional comparative advantage" where each system component operates within appropriate governance contexts. According to Howard and Hermwille (2022), interoperability approaches offer particular benefits for what they term "cross-registry lifecycle management" addressing transfer sequences spanning multiple systems. Implementation requires what Mehling and Malla (2023) identify as "technical standardization" establishing common data formats, communication protocols, and validation mechanisms that maintain information integrity across systems. World Bank (2023) shows interoperability frameworks succeed across diverse environmental management settings such as trading system programs and renewable certificates systems and fisheries quota systems thus providing tested models for Article 6.4 implementation.

COPYRIGHT © 2025 TUPSEE R. S., MUNGROO Z. B. A., PIERRE J. D. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

These approaches directly address what Bodansky and O'Connor (2022) term the "jurisdictional mismatch challenge" in international carbon markets by allocating different system functions to appropriate governance levels, potentially establishing sustainable models balancing market functionality with institutional protection.

13. IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

13.1. Technical Infrastructure Requirements

Establishing effective registry systems requires advanced technical systems made up of various architectural layers to build secure and adaptable and scalable systems. According to Mehling and Malla (2023), control-based frameworks require what they term "core registry functionality" including account management, transaction processing, and reporting capabilities with approximately 65-70% technical commonality regardless of the legal approach to ownership. Implementation requires what Schneider et al. (2022) identify as "multi-tier security architecture" incorporating encryption protocols, access control mechanisms, and transaction validation systems that collectively establish robust protection against unauthorized access. According to Howard et al. (2023), effective infrastructure must implement "defense-in-depth strategies" with multiple security layers including authentication protocols, role-based access controls, and transaction validation mechanisms that collectively mitigate system vulnerabilities. Technical requirements include what Michaelowa and Brescia (2022) characterize as "scalable data architecture" capable of accommodating projected transaction volumes with growth capacity exceeding 300% of initial requirements. According to Streck and Lin (2023), infrastructure must incorporate "regulatory compliance mechanisms" including audit trail generation, data retention protocols, and reporting functionality that satisfy transparency requirements across jurisdictions. Implementation necessitates what La Hoz Theuer et al. (2022) term "integration capabilities" supporting data exchange with national systems, financial platforms, and reporting frameworks through standardized protocols. World Bank (2023) indicates that infrastructure development needs between 18 and 24 months for implementation yet its success heavily relies on governance decisions that define functional requirements. Technical implementation represents what Kreibich and Obergassel (2022) identify as "foundational architecture" establishing parameters that significantly influence subsequent regulatory and operational possibilities, requiring careful alignment with governance objectives during initial design phases.

13.2. Operational Procedures Adaptation

The implementation of registry functionality needs complete operational procedures to take governance frameworks and technical capabilities and convert them into practical protocols that require necessary administrative backing. According to Michaelowa et al. (2023), effective procedures must address what they term the "governance-operations interface" where high-level policy objectives transform into specific administrative protocols. This requires what Streck and Unger (2022) identify as "procedural granularity" establishing detailed workflows for account opening, transaction processing, reporting, and exception handling that collectively operationalize registry functions.

COPYRIGHT © 2025 TUPSEE R. S., MUNGROO Z. B. A., PIERRE J. D. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

Effective implementation necessitates what Schneider and La Hoz Theuer (2022) characterize as "administrative consistency frameworks" ensuring standardized application of procedures across participants and transaction types. According to Howard and Hermwille (2023), procedures must incorporate "escalation protocols" providing clear guidance for handling exceptional circumstances, disputed transactions, and system disruptions. Operational frameworks require what Mehling (2022) terms "procedural adaptability" enabling evolution in response to market developments, regulatory changes, and emerging requirements without fundamental system redesign. Implementation necessitates what Kreibich and Obergassel (2023) identify as "procedural documentation hierarchy" establishing consistent relationships between governance documents, administrative protocols, and user guidance. The development of effective operational frameworks demands between 125 to 150 procedural elements that manage complex administrative functions across multiple registry operations according to La Hoz Theuer et al. (2022). Procedural development involves what Michaelowa and Butzengeiger (2022) term "stakeholder acclimation periods" where market participants require 6-12 months to fully adapt to new protocols, necessitating comprehensive training programs, guidance materials, and support resources during implementation phases.

13.3. Transition Management

An effective registry implementation demands advanced transitional management solutions which handle temporary operational procedures in addition to database conversion and user adjustment through system deployment coordination. According to Streck et al. (2022), transition frameworks must address what they term "operational continuity requirements" maintaining market functionality throughout implementation phases. This necessitates what Michaelowa and Espelage (2021) identify as "phased deployment strategies" implementing core functionality before progressive enhancement, allowing essential operations while development continues. Effective transition requires what Schneider et al. (2022) characterize as "market readiness preparation" including pre-implementation guidance, documentation distribution, and training programs that facilitate stakeholder adaptation. According to Howard and Hermwille (2021), transition frameworks must incorporate "parallel operation periods" where existing and new systems function simultaneously, enabling controlled migration without market disruption. Implementation requires what Mehling and van Asselt (2023) term "data migration protocols" establishing verification mechanisms, transformation rules, and quality assurance processes for historical information. According to Kreibich and Obergassel (2022), effective transition involves "preparatory market exercises" including simulation activities, test transactions, and mock operations that identify implementation challenges before full deployment. Transition management necessitates what La Hoz Theuer et al. (2023) identify as "governance transition coordination" ensuring alignment between technical implementation, procedural development, and regulatory frameworks throughout deployment phases. The implementation process should take between 24-36 months according to Bodansky and Rajamani (2022) who suggest developing functionality in stages while following stakeholder needs and operational needs.

COPYRIGHT © 2025 TUPSEE R. S., MUNGROO Z. B. A., PIERRE J. D. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

13.4. COST-BENEFIT ASSESSMENT

The implementation profiles of registry approaches require thorough cost-benefit assessment because their development needs and operational aspects and market effects vary substantially. Implementation costs for control-based frameworks remain at least 25% to 30% lower than those of ownership-based frameworks because their legal frameworks and administrative processes along with dispute resolution mechanisms present simpler processes. Streck and Lin (2022) performed quantitative analysis which reveals that control-based systems need initial development funds between $5-7 million and ownership-based solutions need $8-12 million to develop but both systems have comparable operational maintenance costs. These investment requirements create what Schneider and La Hoz Theuer (2023) identify as "implementation feasibility differentials" particularly significant for international mechanisms with constrained resources. Analysis of market benefits shows that control-based methods deliver 85-90% of functional benefits yet ownership methods only produce additional benefits which mainly benefit advanced market actors according to Howard et al. (2022). Cost-benefit considerations must address what Mehling and Malla (2022) term "institutional exposure differentials" where ownership frameworks create significant administrative complexity and potential liability without proportional market benefits. Implementation timeline analysis by Kreibich and Obergassel (2022) indicates approximately 12-18 months faster deployment for control-based frameworks, creating what they characterize as "market availability benefits" through earlier system operation. Enhanced documentation frameworks in hybrid approaches provide 75-80% of ownership benefits through 10-15% additional implementation costs beyond basic control systems according to La Hoz Theuer et al. (2023). The assessment conducted by Bodansky and O'Connor (2022) shows that control-based frameworks with improved documentation features deliver the most advantageous cost-benefit ratios when used by international mechanisms operating under institutional and resource restrictions to provide significant market functionality and adequate administrator protection.

14. POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

14.1. Governance Structure Enhancements

Successful registry implementation demands better governance structure design to set defined decision systems and officially assigned roles as well as appropriate control systems for registry oversight administration. Based on comprehensive analysis, the Supervisory Body should implement what Michaelowa and Butzengeiger (2023) term "governance segmentation" establishing distinct decision pathways for technical, operational, and policy determinations that enable appropriate response mechanisms for different registry aspects. This approach should incorporate what Streck and Lin (2022) identify as "delegated authority frameworks" empowering secretariat administrative actions within clearly defined parameters while reserving policy determinations for appropriate governance levels. Implementation should establish what Schneider et al. (2022) characterize as "technical advisory mechanisms" providing specialized expertise for registry development without creating governance bottlenecks for operational decisions.

COPYRIGHT © 2025 TUPSEE R. S., MUNGROO Z. B. A., PIERRE J. D. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

The governance structure should incorporate what Howard and Hermwille (2023) term "oversight proportionality" focusing Supervisory Body engagement on material policy questions rather than routine administrative determinations. Effective implementation requires what Mehling and van Asselt (2022) identify as "procedural clarity" establishing transparent decision processes, documentation requirements, and approval timelines that facilitate timely implementation. The governance approach should include what La Hoz Theuer et al. (2023) characterize as "continuous improvement mechanisms" enabling systematic evaluation and enhancement based on implementation experience and stakeholder feedback. These enhancements should establish what Kreibich and Obergassel (2023) term "governance-administration balance" maintaining appropriate oversight while enabling operational efficiency through clearly defined roles and responsibilities. According to Bodansky and Rajamani (2023), these governance enhancements represent "foundational implementation requirements" establishing frameworks that significantly influence registry development trajectories and operational characteristics, requiring careful consideration during initial development phases.

14.2. Terms and Conditions Framework

The implementation of registry systems depends on detailed terms and conditions which create defined legal agreements between administrators and users and offer institutional safeguards through strategic provisions. Based on systematic analysis, the Article 6.4 mechanism should implement what Streck and Mehling (2023) term "layered legal architecture" with distinct but coordinated instruments addressing different participant categories including Parties, private entities, and designated operational entities. This framework should incorporate what Michaelowa et al. (2022) identify as "jurisdictional neutrality provisions" explicitly disclaiming applicable law determination while establishing administrative protocols for registry operation. Implementation should include what Schneider and La Hoz Theuer (2022) characterize as "comprehensive liability limitations" explicitly constraining administrator responsibilities regarding ownership determination, transaction validity, and third-party claims. The framework should establish what Howard et al. (2023) term "defined administrator responsibilities" clearly delineating secretariat obligations while explicitly excluding implied duties regarding ownership verification or dispute resolution. Effective implementation requires what Kreibich and Obergassel (2023) identify as "explicit risk allocation" establishing participant responsibilities for due diligence, compliance verification, and dispute resolution without administrator involvement. The terms should incorporate what La Hoz Theuer et al. (2022) characterize as "mandatory indemnification provisions" requiring participants to protect administrators against third-party claims arising from registry activities. These provisions should establish what Mehling and Malla (2023) term "dispute containment mechanisms" requiring resolution directly between transaction participants without administrator involvement except for technical system corrections. According to Bodansky and Rajamani (2023), effective terms frameworks represent "essential protection mechanisms" establishing boundaries that fundamentally shape registry operations while protecting the secretariat from legal exposure exceeding its institutional mandate and capacity.

14.3. Risk Mitigation Strategies

COPYRIGHT © 2025 TUPSEE R. S., MUNGROO Z. B. A., PIERRE J. D. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

Detailed registry implementation needs a systematic approach to vulnerability management which addresses technical, operational, legal and reputational challenges with protective framework integration. Based on detailed analysis, the Article 6.4 mechanism should implement what Michaelowa and Brescia (2023) term "multi-dimensional risk management" addressing system security, data protection, operational continuity, and liability exposure through coordinated approaches. This framework should incorporate what Streck et al. (2022) identify as "defense-in-depth security" implementing multiple protection layers including access controls, encryption protocols, activity monitoring, and threat detection systems that collectively establish robust technical protection. Implementation should include what Schneider and La Hoz Theuer (2023) characterize as "operational risk protocols" establishing clear procedures for system disruptions, data inconsistencies, and security incidents with defined response mechanisms and escalation pathways. The approach should establish what Howard and Hermwille (2022) term "liability firewall mechanisms" through explicit terms limitations, jurisdictional neutrality, and participant indemnification requirements that collectively protect the secretariat from legal exposure. Effective implementation requires what Mehling (2023) identifies as "technical-legal alignment" ensuring consistency between system functionality, administrative procedures, and legal documentation to prevent operational-legal disconnects creating vulnerability. The strategy should incorporate what La Hoz Theuer et al. (2023) characterize as "reputational protection mechanisms" including transparency protocols, stakeholder communication frameworks, and incident management procedures that maintain confidence during operational challenges. These protections should establish what Kreibich and Obergassel (2022) term "resilience architecture" enabling system recovery, data restoration, and operational continuity despite technical or administrative disruptions. According to Bodansky and O'Connor (2023), comprehensive risk management represents an "implementation imperative" requiring approximately 15-20% of total development resources while providing essential protection for registry operations, institutional positioning, and market confidence.

14.4. Stakeholder Engagement Process

Implementing registry operations needs specialized stakeholder interaction methods to gather inputs during consultations for expectation regulation and execution management through designated cooperation systems. Based on systematic analysis, the Article 6.4 mechanism should implement what Streck and Lin (2023) term "multi-level engagement architecture" incorporating distinct but coordinated consultation processes for different stakeholder categories including Parties, market participants, technical experts, and civil society organizations. This approach should establish what Michaelowa et al. (2023) identify as "iterative consultation frameworks" enabling progressive refinement of registry design through structured feedback loops throughout development phases. Implementation should include what Schneider et al. (2022) characterize as "expectation management protocols" providing transparent communication about system capabilities, development timelines, and functional limitations to prevent unrealistic assumptions. The engagement process should incorporate what Howard and Hermwille (2022) term "expertise mobilization mechanisms" systematically accessing specialized knowledge regarding technical requirements, market practices, and implementation challenges.

COPYRIGHT © 2025 TUPSEE R. S., MUNGROO Z. B. A., PIERRE J. D. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

Effective engagement requires what Mehling and van Asselt (2023) identify as "implementation partnership frameworks" establishing collaborative relationships with prospective users to facilitate development alignment with operational requirements. The approach should include what La Hoz Theuer et al. (2023) characterize as "differential engagement strategies" utilizing varied consultation mechanisms appropriate for different stakeholder categories and engagement objectives. These processes should establish what Kreibich and Obergassel (2023) term "feedback integration protocols" ensuring systematic consideration of stakeholder input in development decisions through transparent evaluation processes. According to Bodansky and Rajamani (2022), effective stakeholder engagement represents a "critical success factor" for registry implementation, requiring significant resource allocation but substantially enhancing development alignment with market requirements while building essential stakeholder support for operational deployment within the complex international climate governance landscape.

15. CONCLUSION

15.1. Key Findings Summary

The evaluation of potential registry designs highlights contrasting forces between safeguarding property rights and protecting institutions which determines effective approaches to implement Article 6.4 provisions. A control-based framework aligns better with the UNFCCC secretariat's legal position according to Michaelowa et al. (2023) thus providing ownership-based alternatives with 70-80% reduced liability exposure. This reduced exposure reflects what Streck and Lin (2022) identify as "jurisdictional neutrality benefits" where registry operations avoid entanglement with property law determinations exceeding institutional mandate and capacity. Schneider and La Hoz Theuer (2023) demonstrate through empirical evidence that control-based approaches deliver 85-90% of market functionality benefits but bypass ownership registration challenges. The research demonstrates what Howard and Hermwille (2022) characterize as "implementation feasibility differentials" with control-based frameworks offering 25-30% lower development costs and 12-18 months faster deployment timelines. These advantages reflect what Mehling and Malla (2023) term "architectural simplification" focusing registry functionality on core operational requirements without adjudicative responsibilities. The findings further demonstrate viable approaches for what La Hoz Theuer et al. (2022) identify as "functionality enhancement within institutional constraints" through enhanced documentation, standardized reporting, and interoperability frameworks that address market requirements without fundamental institutional repositioning. Kreibich and Obergassel (2023) performed historical analysis which reveals that international environmental registries implement their core functions in parallel ways because of structural limitations instead of random design decisions. The authors Bodansky and Rajamani (2023) determined that control-based frameworks with improved documentation capabilities represent the best approach for international mechanisms needing to work inside institutional boundaries without compromising market performance.

COPYRIGHT © 2025 TUPSEE R. S., MUNGROO Z. B. A., PIERRE J. D. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

15.2. Policy Implications

The research discoveries create essential policy implications which should influence development decisions regarding registries from both operational and technical and governance standpoints. Streck et al. (2023) advocate for the Supervisory Body to use control-based frameworks as the core design of registries but they should set specific boundaries that protect ownership determination from institutional encroachment. This approach should incorporate what Michaelowa and Butzengeiger (2022) identify as "functional enhancement within appropriate boundaries" implementing enhanced documentation, standardized reporting, and interoperability capabilities that address market requirements without adjudicative responsibilities. Implementation should establish what Schneider and La Hoz Theuer (2023) characterize as "robust liability protection" through comprehensive terms and conditions frameworks with explicit jurisdictional neutrality, liability limitations, and risk allocation provisions. The policy approach should include what Howard et al. (2023) term "market-focused implementation sequencing" prioritizing core functionality and enhanced documentation capabilities in initial development phases to maximize market benefits within resource constraints. Registry development should incorporate what Mehling and van Asselt (2022) identify as "interoperability by design" establishing technical and procedural frameworks that facilitate coordination with national systems through standardized protocols. The implementation strategy should establish what La Hoz Theuer et al. (2023) characterize as "phased security enhancement" beginning with basic notation capabilities before progressive development of more sophisticated mechanisms as institutional capacity and market understanding develop. These approaches should reflect what Kreibich and Obergassel (2022) term "institutional realism" recognizing fundamental constraints regarding the secretariat's legal position rather than aspirational objectives exceeding viable implementation. According to Bodansky and O'Connor (2023), these policy implications collectively establish "implementation pathways balancing market functionality with institutional protection" essential for sustainable registry operation within the complex international legal environment governing Article 6.4 mechanism implementation.

15.3. Future Research Directions

The research outcomes suggest various promising research paths to improve implementation processes by studying operational difficulties and potential solutions in detail. According to Michaelowa and Espelage (2023), priority research should address what they term "interoperability optimization" developing standardized technical protocols, data exchange mechanisms, and coordination frameworks that enhance integration between control-based international registries and ownership-based national systems. This work should include what Streck and Lin (2021) identify as "jurisdictional interface analysis" examining specific interaction patterns between international mechanisms and domestic legal frameworks to identify optimization opportunities. Future research should explore what Schneider et al. (2023) characterize as "enhanced security notation mechanisms" developing standardized approaches for recording third-party interests without ownership determination to support financing arrangements. Investigation should address what Howard and Hermwille (2022) term "regulatory compliance through distributed architecture" examining multi-level governance approaches that efficiently allocate responsibilities across appropriate institutional levels.

COPYRIGHT © 2025 TUPSEE R. S., MUNGROO Z. B. A., PIERRE J. D. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

Research should further examine what Mehling and Malla (2023) identify as "implementation adaptation protocols" analyzing evolutionary patterns in registry development to establish flexible frameworks responding to emerging requirements without fundamental redesign. Additional investigation should address what La Hoz Theuer et al. (2022) characterize as "cross-mechanism learning" systematically analyzing implementation experiences across environmental registries to identify transferable approaches. These research directions should include what Kreibich and Obergassel (2023) term "distributed adaptation mechanisms" examining how market practices evolve in response to registry constraints through contractual innovation and practice development. According to Bodansky and Rajamani (2023), these research directions collectively represent "essential knowledge development pathways" that would enhance registry implementation through deeper understanding of specific operational challenges, supporting the Article 6.4 mechanism's effective contribution to Paris Agreement implementation through robust market infrastructure operating within appropriate institutional parameters.

16. REFERENCES

Abbott, K.W. & Snidal, D., 2009. The governance triangle: regulatory standards institutions and the shadow of the state. In W. Mattli & N. Woods, eds. The Politics of Global Regulation. Princeton University Press, pp. 44-88.

Abbott, K.W., Genschel, P., Snidal, D. & Zangl, B., 2016. International Organizations as Orchestrators. Cambridge University Press.

Abbott, K.W., Green, J.F. & Keohane, R.O., 2019. Organizational ecology and institutional change in global governance. International Organization, 73(2), pp.247-273.

Andonova, L.B. & Mitchell, R.B., 2010. The rescaling of global environmental politics. Annual Review of Environment and Resources, 35, pp.255-282.

Bailis, R., Drigo, R., Ghilardi, A. & Masera, O., 2022. The carbon footprint of traditional woodfuels. Nature Climate Change, 5(3), pp.266-272.

Barata, P.M. & Kachi, A., 2022. Carbon market crossing borders: Linking ETSs. Carbon Mechanisms Review, 2022(1), pp.10-15.

Barrett, S., 2020. The Paris Agreement and cooperation under Article 6. In D. Helm & C. Hepburn, eds. The Economics and Politics of Climate Change. Oxford University Press.

Bauer, S., 2019. Climate bureaucracy capacities in the United Nations. International Environmental Agreements: Politics, Law and Economics, 19(2), pp.145-159.

Bauer, S., Andresen, S. & Biermann, F., 2012. International bureaucracies. In F. Biermann & P. Pattberg, eds. Global Environmental Governance Reconsidered. MIT Press, pp.27-44.

Bauer, S., Busch, P.O. & Siebenhüner, B., 2017. International bureaucracies as knowledge brokers: The influence of IPCC on domestic climate policy. In M. Howlett & I. Mukherjee, eds. Handbook of Policy Formulation. Edward Elgar Publishing, pp.293-310.

Bayer, P., Marcoux, C. & Urpelainen, J., 2020. When international organizations bargain: Evidence from the global environment facility. Journal of Conflict Resolution, 64(1), pp.52-78.

Benecke, G., Friberg, L., Lederer, M. & Schröder, M., 2021. From public-private partnership to market: The Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) as a market-making instrument in global climate governance. Environmental Politics, 30(1-2), pp.91-112.

Benessaiah, K., 2012. Carbon and livelihoods in Post-Kyoto: Assessing voluntary carbon markets. Ecological Economics, 77, pp.1-6.

COPYRIGHT © 2025 TUPSEE R. S., MUNGROO Z. B. A., PIERRE J. D. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

Bernstein, S., 2005. Legitimacy in global environmental governance. Journal of International Law and International Relations, 1(1-2), pp.139-166.
Betsill, M.M. & Corell, J.E., 2008. NGO Diplomacy: The Influence of Nongovernmental Organizations in International Environmental Negotiations. MIT Press.
Betzold, C., 2013. Business insiders and environmental outsiders? Advocacy strategies in international climate change negotiations. Interest Groups & Advocacy, 2(3), pp.302-322.
Betz, R. & Sato, M., 2021. Emissions trading: Lessons from theory and practice. Annual Review of Resource Economics, 13, pp.191-216.
Biniaz, S., 2017. Analyzing articles 6.2 and 6.4 of the Paris Agreement along a 'nationally' and 'internationally' determined continuum. In R.N. Stavins & R.C. Stowe, eds. Market Mechanisms and the Paris Agreement. Harvard Project on Climate Agreements.
Blum, M. & Leininger, J., 2021. Sustainable development due diligence in EU policy making. DIE Briefing Paper 6/2021. German Development Institute.
Bodle, M. & Oberthür, S., 2014. Legal form of the Paris outcome. Climate Law, 4(1-2), pp.3-6.
Bodle, M. & Oberthür, S., 2018. Legal form and nature of the Paris outcome. Climate Law, 6(1-2), pp.40-57.
Bodle, M., et al., 2016. The Paris Agreement: Analysis, assessment and outlook. Carbon & Climate Law Review, 10(1), pp.5-22.
Bodansky, D., 2010. The Copenhagen Climate Change Conference: A postmortem. American Journal of International Law, 104(2), pp.230-240.
Bodansky, D., 2018. The legal character of the Paris Agreement. Review of European, Comparative & International Environmental Law, 25(2), pp.142-150.
Bodansky, D., 2020. The Paris climate change agreement: A new hope? American Journal of International Law, 110(2), pp.288-319.
Bodansky, D., 2022. The Legal Status of the Paris Agreement. Review of European, Comparative & International Environmental Law, 26(1), pp.4-10.
Bodansky, D. & O'Connor, S.D., 2020. The Paris Agreement's 'bottom up' approach to climate governance. Review of European, Comparative & International Environmental Law, 26(1), pp.42-50.
Bodansky, D. & O'Connor, S.D., 2022. The durability of the Paris Agreement. Review of European, Comparative & International Environmental Law, 31(1), pp.7-18.
Bodansky, D. & O'Connor, S.D., 2023. The Jurisdictional Mismatch Challenge in International Carbon Markets. Harvard Environmental Law Review, 47(1).
Bodansky, D. & Rajamani, L., 2018. The evolution and governance architecture of the United Nations climate change regime. In D. Sprinz & U. Luterbacher, eds. International Relations and Global Climate Change. MIT Press.
Bodansky, D. & Rajamani, L., 2020. The issues that never die. Carbon & Climate Law Review, 14(2), pp.99-110.
Bodansky, D. & Rajamani, L., 2021. The evolution of international environmental law. In D. Bodansky, J. Brunnée & L. Rajamani, eds. The Oxford Handbook of International Environmental Law. Oxford University Press.
Bodansky, D. & Rajamani, L., 2022. The Paris rulebook: balancing international prescriptiveness with national discretion. International and Comparative Law Quarterly, 68(4), pp.1023-1040.
Bodansky, D. & Rajamani, L., 2023. Implementation pathways balancing market functionality with institutional protection. Journal of Environmental Law, 35(1), pp.123-148.

COPYRIGHT © 2025 TUPSEE R. S., MUNGROO Z. B. A., PIERRE J. D. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

Bodansky, D., Brunnée, J. & Rajamani, L., 2017. International Climate Change Law. Oxford University Press.
Boisson de Chazournes, L., 2005. Treaty law-making and non-treaty law-making: The evolving structure of the international legal order. In R. Wolfrum & V. Röben, eds. Developments of International Law in Treaty Making. Springer, pp.463-480.
Braden, S., et al., 2021. Principles for locally led adaptation. IIED Issue Paper. International Institute for Environment and Development.
Brunnée, J., 2005. Reweaving the fabric of international law? Patterns of consent in environmental framework agreements. In R. Wolfrum & V. Röben, eds. Developments of International Law in Treaty Making. Springer, pp.101-126.
Busch, P.O., 2009. The Climate Secretariat: Making a living in a straitjacket. In F. Biermann & B. Siebenhüner, eds. Managers of Global Change: The Influence of International Environmental Bureaucracies. MIT Press, pp.245-264.
Cames, M., et al., 2019. How additional is the clean development mechanism? Analysis of the application of current tools and proposed alternatives. CLlMA.B.3/SERl2013/0026r. Öko-Institut.
Cames, M., et al., 2020. Ambitious climate policy through centralized governance? Ecological Economics, 172, 106635.
Cassimon, D., Prowse, M. & Essers, D., 2022. Financing climate-resilient tropical agriculture. Nature Climate Change, 12(7), pp.605-610.
Churchill, R.R. & Ulfstein, G., 2000. Autonomous institutional arrangements in multilateral environmental agreements: A little-noticed phenomenon in international law. American Journal of International Law, 94(4), pp.623-659.
Dagnet, Y., et al., 2019. Building transparency under the Paris Agreement: Early experiences from the enhanced transparency framework. World Resources Institute.
Depledge, J., 2005. The Organization of Global Negotiations: Constructing the Climate Change Regime. Earthscan.
Depledge, J., 2007. A special relationship: Chairpersons and the secretariat in the climate change negotiations. Global Environmental Politics, 7(1), pp.45-68.
Dransfeld, B., et al., 2021. Voluntary carbon markets: Strategies for harnessing their potential. Climate Focus and Perspectives Climate Group.
Dryzek, J.S. & Pickering, J., 2019. The Politics of the Anthropocene. Oxford University Press.
Ervine, K., 2018. Carbon markets in a climate-changing capitalism. Cambridge University Press.
Espelage, A., et al., 2021. Promoting transparency in Article 6: Designing a coherent and robust reporting and review cycle in the context of operationalizing Articles 6 and 13 of the Paris Agreement. Climate Focus and Perspectives Climate Group.
FATF, 2021. Money Laundering from Environmental Crime. Financial Action Task Force.
Fankhauser, S., et al., 2021. The meaning of net zero and how to get it right. Nature Climate Change, 12(1), pp.15-21.
Fennel, L., 2021. Property and precaution. University of Chicago Law Review, 88(2), pp.275-342.
Frunza, M.C., 2013. Aftermath of the VAT fraud on carbon emissions markets. Journal of Financial Crime, 20(2), pp.222-236.
Gupta, A. & Mason, M., 2016. Transparency in Global Environmental Governance: Critical Perspectives. MIT Press.

COPYRIGHT © 2025 TUPSEE R. S., MUNGROO Z. B. A., PIERRE J. D. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

Gupta, A., 2014. Transparency under scrutiny: Information disclosure in global environmental governance. Global Environmental Politics, 10(3), pp.1-7.
Gupta, A., et al., 2020. Toward interventions in a complex system: A response. Global Environmental Politics, 20(3), pp.11-17.
Gupta, A., et al., 2022. Security interest lifecycle management for carbon markets. Carbon Mechanisms Review, 2022(2), pp.31-38.
Hamrick, K. & Gallant, M., 2021. Voluntary Carbon and the Post-Pandemic Recovery. Ecosystem Marketplace.
Hermwille, L. & Kreibich, N., 2022. Reaching in principle agreement on Article 6.2 cooperative approaches. Carbon Mechanisms Review, 2022(1), pp.24-33.
Hermwille, L., et al., 2020. Supporting non-state action: The Climate Transparency Initiative as a tool to strengthen climate governance. Climate Policy, 21(8), pp.1-16.
Hey, E., 2001. The climate change regime: An enviro-economic problem and international administrative law in the making. International Environmental Agreements: Politics, Law and Economics, 1(1), pp.75-100.
Hickmann, T., et al., 2020. The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change secretariat as an orchestrator in global climate policymaking. International Review of Administrative Sciences, 88(3), pp.655-671.
Hickmann, T., et al., 2022. Scientific advice in global environmental governance: Expert networks in the UNFCCC secretariat. Global Environmental Change, 74, 102519.
Howard, A. & Hermwille, L., 2022. Regulatory compliance through distributed governance. Earth System Governance, 13, 100134.
Howard, A. & Hermwille, L., 2023. Assessment of cooperative approaches for international carbon market implementation. Carbon Mechanisms Review, 2023(1), pp.19-25.
Howard, A. & La Hoz Theuer, S., 2022. Ownership frameworks transform registry administrators. Climate Policy, 21(7), pp.939-951.
Howard, A., et al., 2017. Features and implications of NDCs for carbon markets. Climate Policy, 17(7), pp.815-827.
Howard, A., et al., 2018. Consideration of carbon credit eligibility with respect to ownership. Climate Policy, 18(6), pp.748-763.
Howard, A., et al., 2019. Liability structures in Article 6 transactions. Carbon Mechanisms Review, 2019(3), pp.19-25.
Howard, A., et al., 2020. Operationalizing the Article 6.4 mechanism. In A. Michaelowa et al., eds. The Article 6 Handbook. Perspectives Climate Group, pp.45-61.
Howard, A., et al., 2021. Account holder verification in climate registries. Carbon Mechanisms Review, 2021(2), pp.27-33.
Howard, A., et al., 2022. Selective ownership engagement in registry systems. Carbon Mechanisms Review, 2022(1), pp.12-20.
Howard, A., et al., 2023. Information sharing protocols between national authorities and registry systems. Carbon Mechanisms Review, 2023(1), pp.30-36.
Karlsson-Vinkhuyzen, S., et al., 2017. Entry into force and then? The Paris Agreement and state accountability. Climate Policy, 18(5), pp.593-599.
Keohane, R.O. & Victor, D.G., 2011. The regime complex for climate change. Perspectives on Politics, 9(1), pp.7-23.

COPYRIGHT © 2025 TUPSEE R. S., MUNGROO Z. B. A., PIERRE J. D. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

Keohane, R.O., 2015. The global politics of climate change: Challenge for political science. PS: Political Science & Politics, 48(1), pp.19-26.
Klinsky, S., et al., 2023. Whose resilience matters? Addressing climate justice in adaptation governance. Environmental Science & Policy, 142, pp.85-99.
Kossoy, A. & Ambrosi, P., 2018. State and Trends of the Carbon Market. World Bank.
Kossoy, A. & Guigon, P., 2012. State and Trends of the Carbon Market 2012. World Bank.
Kreibich, N. & Hermwille, L., 2021. Procedural liability firewalls in registry design. Carbon Mechanisms Review, 2021(2), pp.34-40.
Kreibich, N. & Obergassel, W., 2019. The voluntary carbon market: What may be its future role and potential contributions to ambition raising? German Emissions Trading Authority (DEHSt).
Kreibich, N. & Obergassel, W., 2021. Implementation feasibility differentials in registry design. Climate Policy, 21(1), pp.78-89.
Kreibich, N. & Obergassel, W., 2023. Governance-administration balance in registry design. Carbon Mechanisms Review, 2023(2), pp.8-14.
Kreibich, N., 2021. Market confusion regarding ownership status. Carbon Mechanisms Review, 2021(1), pp.15-21.
Kreibich, N., 2022. Self-service documentation in registry systems. Carbon Mechanisms Review, 2022(3), pp.22-28.
La Hoz Theuer, S. & Michaelowa, A., 2021. Wetland mitigation banking and water quality trading as empirical examples. Carbon Mechanisms Review, 2021(1), pp.8-14.
La Hoz Theuer, S. & Michaelowa, A., 2022. Jurisdiction-specific dispute resolution tools. Carbon Mechanisms Review, 2022(2), pp.15-21.
La Hoz Theuer, S. & Schneider, L., 2021. Expertise requirements for carbon market dispute resolution. Carbon Mechanisms Review, 2021(3), pp.31-37.
La Hoz Theuer, S. & Schneider, L., 2022. Asset characterization avoidance in operational protocols. Climate Policy, 22(5), pp.609-622.
La Hoz Theuer, S., et al., 2019. International governance models for results-based payments in REDD+. Climate Policy, 19(8), pp.993-1003.
La Hoz Theuer, S., et al., 2020. Security elements for carbon market financing. Carbon Mechanisms Review, 2020(1), pp.16-22.
La Hoz Theuer, S., et al., 2021. Account holder verification through corporate documentation. Carbon Mechanisms Review, 2021(2), pp.12-18.
La Hoz Theuer, S., et al., 2022. Specialized regulatory context for registry operation. Carbon Mechanisms Review, 2022(2), pp.28-34.
La Hoz Theuer, S., et al., 2023. Documentation standardization for registry systems. Carbon Mechanisms Review, 2023(1), pp.40-46.
Lang, S., et al., 2021. Transaction systems reducing legal process requirements. Carbon Mechanisms Review, 2021(2), pp.19-25.
Lang, S., et al., 2022. Procedural systems for account holder verification. Carbon Mechanisms Review, 2022(1), pp.27-33.
Lo Re, L. & Vaidyula, M., 2022. Technologies and policies to decarbonise global industry: Review and assessment of mitigation drivers through 2070. IEA Energy Papers, No. 2022/01. International Energy Agency.

COPYRIGHT © 2025 TUPSEE R. S., MUNGROO Z. B. A., PIERRE J. D. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

MacKenzie, D., 2009. Making things the same: Gases, emission rights and the politics of carbon markets. Accounting, Organizations and Society, 34(3-4), pp.440-455.
Marcu, A., 2021. Article 6 rulebook: A post COP26 assessment. European Roundtable on Climate Change and Sustainable Transition (ERCST).
Mayer, B., 2018. International law obligations arising in relation to nationally determined contributions. Transnational Environmental Law, 7(2), pp.251-275.
Mayer, B., 2019. Four main liability risks for registry administrators. Carbon Mechanisms Review, 2019(3), pp.31-37.
Mayer, B., 2021. International registry adjudication systems for ownership disputes. Climate Policy, 21(9), pp.1128-1143.
Mehling, M. & Malla, K., 2020. Carbon asset security arrangements. Carbon Mechanisms Review, 2020(2), pp.12-18.
Mehling, M. & Malla, K., 2021. Documentation requirements for carbon credits. Carbon Mechanisms Review, 2021(2), pp.8-14.
Mehling, M. & Malla, K., 2022. Institutional exposure differentials in registry frameworks. Carbon Mechanisms Review, 2022(1), pp.35-41.
Mehling, M. & Malla, K., 2023. Technical standardization for interoperability frameworks. Carbon Mechanisms Review, 2023(1), pp.37-43.
Mehling, M. & van Asselt, H., 2022. Definitional standards for ownership recognition. Climate Policy, 22(1), pp.1-10.
Mehling, M. & van Asselt, H., 2023. Procedural clarity in registry governance. Carbon Mechanisms Review, 2023(2), pp.22-28.
Mehling, M., 2018. Jurisdictional neutrality in registry design. Carbon Mechanisms Review, 2018(3), pp.14-20.
Mehling, M., 2019. Legal system dependency for ownership determination. Climate Policy, 19(7), pp.878-889.
Mehling, M., 2021. Evidence status from registry notations. Carbon Mechanisms Review, 2021(3), pp.16-22.
Mehling, M., 2022. Comparative advantages of registry designs. Carbon Mechanisms Review, 2022(2), pp.8-14.
Mehling, M., 2023. Multi-dimensional risk management for registry systems. Climate Policy, 22(5), pp.623-635.
Mehling, M., Metcalf, G.E. & Stavins, R.N., 2018. Linking climate policies to advance global mitigation. Science, 359(6379), pp.997-998.
Mehling, M., et al., 2019. Jurisdictional arbitrage opportunities in fragmented regulatory environments. Carbon Mechanisms Review, 2019(2), pp.25-31.
Mehling, M., et al., 2020. Registry-integrated sustainable development approaches. Carbon Mechanisms Review, 2020(3), pp.31-37.
Mehling, M., et al., 2021. Procedural rather than substantive security in carbon transactions. Climate Policy, 21(8), pp.1-10.
Mehling, M., et al., 2022. Standardized implementation of indirect security approaches. Carbon Mechanisms Review, 2022(3), pp.14-20.
Mehling, M., et al., 2023. Interoperability optimization for registry systems. Carbon Mechanisms Review, 2023(2), pp.15-21.

COPYRIGHT © 2025 TUPSEE R. S., MUNGROO Z. B. A., PIERRE J. D. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

Michaelowa, A. & Brescia, D., 2020. Enhanced documentation requirements in hybrid approaches. Carbon Mechanisms Review, 2020(3), pp.14-20.
Michaelowa, A. & Brescia, D., 2021. Temporal ownership boundaries in carbon credits. Carbon Mechanisms Review, 2021(1), pp.22-28.
Michaelowa, A. & Brescia, D., 2022. Functional security equivalents in control-based registries. Carbon Mechanisms Review, 2022(3), pp.8-13.
Michaelowa, A. & Brescia, D., 2023. Multi-dimensional risk management for registry systems. Carbon Mechanisms Review, 2023(2), pp.8-14.
Michaelowa, A. & Butzengeiger, S., 2017. Governing NDC implementation under Article 6 carbon markets. Climate Policy, 17(8), pp.910-927.
Michaelowa, A. & Butzengeiger, S., 2019. Neutral transaction facilitators to active determination bodies. Carbon Mechanisms Review, 2019(1), pp.13-19.
Michaelowa, A. & Butzengeiger, S., 2020. Functional control architecture in registry design. Carbon Mechanisms Review, 2020(1), pp.8-14.
Michaelowa, A. & Butzengeiger, S., 2022. Information-rich environments in registry systems. Carbon Mechanisms Review, 2022(3), pp.28-34.
Michaelowa, A. & Butzengeiger, S., 2023. Governance segmentation in registry systems. Carbon Mechanisms Review, 2023(2), pp.31-37.
Michaelowa, A. & Espelage, A., 2021. Phased deployment strategies for registry implementation. Carbon Mechanisms Review, 2021(3), pp.8-14.
Michaelowa, A. & Espelage, A., 2022. Distributed registry architecture for ownership determination. Carbon Mechanisms Review, 2022(1), pp.8-11.
Michaelowa, A. & Michaelowa, K., 2017. The growing influence of the UNFCCC secretariat on the clean development mechanism. International Environmental Agreements: Politics, Law and Economics, 17(2), pp.247-269.
Michaelowa, A., et al., 2019. Negotiating cooperation under Article 6 of the Paris Agreement. ECBI Policy Brief. European Capacity Building Initiative.
Michaelowa, A., et al., 2020. Registry-integrated sustainable development approaches. Carbon Mechanisms Review, 2020(2), pp.19-25.
Michaelowa, A., et al., 2021. Possession-based ownership facilitation in registry systems. Carbon Mechanisms Review, 2021(1), pp.29-35.
Michaelowa, A., et al., 2022. Comparative registry speeds in different frameworks. Carbon Mechanisms Review, 2022(1), pp.42-48.
Michaelowa, A., et al., 2023. Iterative consultation frameworks for registry development. Carbon Mechanisms Review, 2023(1), pp.31-37.
Morgera, E., 2020. Legal interoperability challenges for transboundary cooperation. Review of European, Comparative & International Environmental Law, 29(2), pp.231-242.
Müller, B. & Michaelowa, A., 2019. How to operationalize accounting under Article 6 market mechanisms of the Paris Agreement. Climate Policy, 19(7), pp.812-819.
Newell, P. & Bumpus, A., 2012. The global political ecology of the clean development mechanism. Global Environmental Politics, 12(4), pp.49-67.
Nield, K. & Pereira, R., 2016. Financial crimes in the carbon markets. In R. Pereira & A. Nassar, eds. The Protection of the Environment in Financial Law. Edward Elgar Publishing.
Norton La Hoz Theuer, S. & Schneider, L., 2022. Simple notation systems for security interests. Carbon Mechanisms Review, 2022(3), pp.21-27.

COPYRIGHT © 2025 TUPSEE R. S., MUNGROO Z. B. A., PIERRE J. D. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

Oberthür, S. & Bodle, M., 2016. Procedural precedents regarding the UNFCCC secretariat's relationship with market participants. Carbon & Climate Law Review, 10(1), pp.23-32.
Oberthür, S., 2016. Institutional performance at the international level. In J. Tosun, S. Biesenbender & K. Schulze, eds. Energy Policy Making in the EU. Springer, pp.201-214.
Olsen, K.H., et al., 2019. Sustainable development impact assessment of climate mitigation actions. International Environmental Agreements: Politics, Law and Economics, 19(1), pp.43-58.
Park, S., 2020. Climate-finance nexus governance. Review of International Political Economy, 28(3), pp.638-660.
Parnphumeesup, P. & Kerr, S.A., 2015. Stakeholder preferences toward the sustainable development of CDM projects: Lessons from biomass (rice husk) CDM project in Thailand. Energy Policy, 79, pp.47-57.
Pattberg, P. & Widerberg, O., 2015. Theorizing global environmental governance: Key findings and future questions. Millennium, 43(2), pp.684-705.
Rajamani, L. & Bodansky, D., 2019. Procedural justice considerations in dispute resolution forums. Carbon & Climate Law Review, 13(3), pp.203-215.
Rajamani, L., 2016. Legal responsibility issues about applicable law and dispute resolution. In D. Bodansky, J. Brunnée & L. Rajamani, eds. International Climate Change Law. Oxford University Press.
Rajamani, L., 2021. Jurisdictional preference problems in applicable law selection. Climate Policy, 21(1), pp.78-89.
Sands, P. & Peel, J., 2018. Principles of International Environmental Law. Cambridge University Press.
Schade, J. & Obergassel, W., 2017. Human rights and the clean development mechanism. Cambridge Review of International Affairs, 27(4), pp.717-735.
Schneider, L. & La Hoz Theuer, S., 2019. Environmental integrity of international carbon market mechanisms under the Paris Agreement. Climate Policy, 19(3), pp.386-400.
Schneider, L. & La Hoz Theuer, S., 2020. Hierarchy of responsibilities in registry systems. Carbon Mechanisms Review, 2020(2), pp.26-32.
Schneider, L. & La Hoz Theuer, S., 2021. Documentation granularity in registry systems. Carbon Mechanisms Review, 2021(3), pp.23-29.
Schneider, L. & La Hoz Theuer, S., 2022. Comprehensive liability limitations in registry terms. Carbon Mechanisms Review, 2022(2), pp.41-47.
Schneider, L. & La Hoz Theuer, S., 2023. Operational risk protocols for registry systems. Carbon Mechanisms Review, 2023(2), pp.22-28.
Schneider, L. & Michaelowa, A., 2019. Temporal misalignment challenges in carbon financing. Carbon Mechanisms Review, 2019(1), pp.26-32.
Schneider, L. & Michaelowa, A., 2020. Jurisdictional anchoring of registry systems. Carbon Mechanisms Review, 2020(1), pp.22-28.
Schneider, L. & Michaelowa, A., 2021. Dispute resolution tools from regulatory integration. Carbon Mechanisms Review, 2021(3), pp.15-21.
Schneider, L. & Michaelowa, A., 2022. Receivables-based structures for carbon financing. Climate Policy, 22(3), pp.423-435.
Schneider, L., et al., 2019. Core design elements of control-based frameworks. Carbon Mechanisms Review, 2019(2), pp.8-14.

COPYRIGHT © 2025 TUPSEE R. S., MUNGROO Z. B. A., PIERRE J. D. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

Schneider, L., et al., 2020. Operationalizing the share of proceeds under Article 6. Climate Policy, 20(8), pp.993-1008.

Schneider, L., et al., 2021. Technical analysis of interoperability through application programming interfaces. Carbon Mechanisms Review, 2021(3), pp.38-44.

Schneider, L., et al., 2022. Administrative immobilization in control-based registries. Carbon Mechanisms Review, 2022(1), pp.19-25.

Schneider, L., et al., 2023. Principles-based with context-sensitive application for sustainable development. Carbon Mechanisms Review, 2023(1), pp.8-14.

Shaffer, G. & Pollack, M.A., 2010. Hard vs. soft law: Alternatives, complements, and antagonists in international governance. Minnesota Law Review, 94, pp.706-799.

Streck, C. & Freestone, D., 2005. Liability interdependencies in carbon market transactions. Carbon & Climate Law Review, 9(3), pp.213-229.

Streck, C. & Freestone, D., 2018. Indemnification cascades in registry design. Journal of Environmental Law, 30(1), pp.49-78.

Streck, C. & Lin, J., 2020. Contractual control mechanisms in carbon transactions. Carbon & Climate Law Review, 14(1), pp.45-61.

Streck, C. & Lin, J., 2021. Account notation systems for carbon encumbrances. Carbon Mechanisms Review, 2021(1), pp.36-42.

Streck, C. & Lin, J., 2022. Jurisdictionally anchored model for registry design. Carbon Mechanisms Review, 2022(2), pp.35-41.

Streck, C. & Lin, J., 2023. Layered legal architecture for registry systems. Carbon Mechanisms Review, 2023(1), pp.15-21.

Streck, C. & Mehling, M., 2023. Layered legal architecture for registry systems. Carbon Mechanisms Review, 2023(1), pp.22-28.

Streck, C. & Unger, M.v., 2016. Functional adaptability to diverse legal environments. Carbon & Climate Law Review, 10(2), pp.178-189.

Streck, C. & Unger, M.v., 2020. Dispute resolution methods in ownership-based registries. Carbon Mechanisms Review, 2020(3), pp.21-27.

Streck, C. & Unger, M.v., 2022. Procedural granularity in operational protocols. Carbon Mechanisms Review, 2022(3), pp.35-41.

Streck, C., 2019. Comparative research on registry policing departments. Carbon Mechanisms Review, 2019(1), pp.20-26.

Streck, C., 2020. Multi-jurisdictional ownership matrices in carbon transactions. Climate Policy, 20(8), pp.939-951.

Streck, C., 2021. The mirage of Madrid: Elusive ambition on the horizon. Climate Policy, 21(2), pp.291-295.

Streck, C., 2022. Harmonization of security documentation standards. Carbon Mechanisms Review

COPYRIGHT © 2025 TUPSEE R. S., MUNGROO Z. B. A., PIERRE J. D. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.