Submission to a Call for Input: Ownership of account holdings in the A6.4 mechanism registry

Document reviewed: Analysis of the Pros and Cons Related to Framing Users' Rights with regard to Control Versus Confirming Ownership of Account Holdings (Document A6.4-SBM015-AA-A11)

Section	Feedback
Legal complexity of ownership	Recognizing legal ownership within the registry would require harmonization across diverse national legal systems, which is difficult and could expose the registry to legal liability. Most international registries (e.g., CDM, voluntary carbon registries) avoid formal recognition of ownership for this reason.
Advantages of a control- based approach	Grants account holders clear rights to manage and transact A6.4ERs. Simplifies registry design by avoiding complex ownership verification processes. Reduces risk and liability for the UNFCCC Secretariat as registry administrator.
Financial and market implications	Market participants may prefer ownership recognition to facilitate financial structuring (e.g., using credits as collateral). However, a control-rights framework can still support financial instruments through contractual arrangements
Pledging and security interests	 Establishing security interests (e.g., pledges) does not require formal recognition of ownership. Control rights alone are sufficient to create enforceable agreements between parties. To maintain integrity and compliance within the registry system: Pledge holders should be required to become account holders in the registry. They must be subject to AML/CFT screenings, like any other registry user. The UNFCCC Secretariat, in its role as registry administrator, may be called upon to enforce valid security interests, in line with the registry's terms and conditions.
Liability and risk management	A control-based model allows for clearer risk allocation and reduces the potential for disputes involving the registry administrator.

Dispute resolution can be kept between transacting parties, preserving registry
neutrality.