

A6.4-AEP009

Meeting report

Ninth meeting of the Accreditation Expert Panel

Version 01.0

Date of meeting: 2 to 3 September 2026

Place of meeting: Bonn, Germany



United Nations
Framework Convention on
Climate Change

TABLE OF CONTENTS		Page
AGENDA ITEM 1.	AGENDA AND MEETING ORGANIZATION	3
Agenda item 1.1.	Opening.....	3
Agenda item 1.2.	Adoption of the agenda.....	3
AGENDA ITEM 2.	GOVERNANCE AND MANAGEMENT MATTERS	3
Agenda item 2.1.	Matters related to the Accreditation Expert Panel	3
Agenda item 2.2.	Status update on applications received	3
AGENDA ITEM 3.	RULINGS (CASE-SPECIFIC MATTERS).....	4
AGENDA ITEM 4.	REGULATORY MATTERS	4
AGENDA ITEM 5.	RELATIONS WITH FORUMS AND OTHER STAKEHOLDERS	4
AGENDA ITEM 6.	CONCLUSION OF THE MEETING	5

Agenda item 1. Agenda and meeting organization

Agenda item 1.1. Opening

1. The Co-Chair of the Accreditation Expert Panel (AEP), Ms. Mominata Elola Compaore, opened the ninth meeting of the AEP (AEP 009).
2. Table 1 shows attendance at the meeting. The names in bold print represent attendance at the meeting, and italics indicate that the member attended the meeting virtually.

Table 1. Attendance

Co-Chairs	Members
Mr. Dexter Lee	Ms. Adriana Guzmán Palacios
Ms. Mominata Elola Compaore	<i>Ms. Anastasia Northland</i>
	Mr. Anil Jauhri
	Mr. Shamiso Mtisi
	Ms. Verónica García de Solórzano

Agenda item 1.2. Adoption of the agenda

3. The AEP adopted the proposed agenda for AEP 009, which was published as document A6.4-AEP009-AA.¹
4. The AEP considered information provided by members and the Co-Chairs with respect to any potential conflict of interest. Statements on conflict of interest can be viewed on the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) website.²

Agenda item 2. Governance and management matters

Agenda item 2.1. Matters related to the Accreditation Expert Panel

5. The AEP took note of the update on the outcome of the twenty-second meeting of the Supervisory Body (SBM 022) relevant to the work of the AEP.

Agenda item 2.2. Status update on applications received

6. The AEP took note of the update from the secretariat on applications received from applicant entities for accreditation under the Article 6.4 mechanism (see table 2).

¹ See <https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/A6.4-AEP009-AA.pdf>.

² See <https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/bodies/constituted-bodies/article-64-supervisory-body/accreditation-expert-panel-aep/meetings>.

Table 2. Workflow status of applicant entities' applications

Workflow status	Number of applicant entities
Completeness check	1
Assessment preparation	1
Desk review	2
On-site assessment	8
Already accredited	18

Agenda item 3. Rulings (case-specific matters)

7. The AEP considered one request for notification of change.

Agenda item 4. Regulatory matters

8. There were no regulatory matters under consideration at this meeting.

Agenda item 5. Relations with forums and other stakeholders

9. The AEP interacted with Mr. Kaviraj Singh representing the Designated Operational Entities/Applicant Entities Coordination Forum and took note of the presentation made by him. The presentation raised queries on the “Standard: Article 6.4 accreditation” (ver. 02.0) for consideration by the AEP.³ The AEP agreed to provide clarification as follows:

- (a) For the first query related to “contract issue” (see SBM 021 report, paragraph 17(a)(ii)), the purpose of paragraph 96 of the “Standard: Article 6.4 accreditation” is to address the threat to impartiality arising from the “customer-pays relationship”.

The provision is intended to prevent a designated operational entity (DOE) from entering into a contract with a project developer, financier or consultant where a conflict of interest exists. It should not be interpreted as requiring the establishment of a nominal or shell activity participant merely for the purpose of executing the contract given that such activity participant shall be authorized by the host Party and participating Party. If the activity has only one activity participant authorized by the host Party and participating Party, and that activity participant is also a project developer, financier or consultant where a conflict of interest exists, the activity participant shall identify another eligible activity participant, for example, an activity owner who is not such project developer, financier or consultant.⁴

Where an activity participant is also the activity owner developing, and financing for its own activity, it shall not, for the purposes of the requirement as per paragraph 96 of the “Standard: Article 6.4 accreditation”, be considered a project developer, financier, or consultant. Such activities do not inherently constitute a conflict of interest for such activity participants;

- (b) For the second query related to the “external experts’ issue”, the AEP 007 report, paragraph 12(c), had clarified that the “expert opinions/expert reports or advisory

³ See https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/bodies/constituted-bodies/article-64-supervisory-body/aep/meetings#_26-meetings.

⁴ The activity owner is the entity that owns or controls the project site, installation, assets and/or equipment through which the Article 6.4 activity is implemented.

services” are not equivalent to validation, verification and certification (VVC) services; therefore, external experts (i) may conduct a critical review of the life cycle analysis if it is part of the VVC activity or third-party conformity assessment; and (ii) shall participate exclusively in VVC activities under the Article 6.4 mechanism and shall not provide expert opinions, expert reports or advisory services, or participate in any other greenhouse gas-related activities under the Article 6.4 mechanism or any other greenhouse gas programme. To cover the expected capacity gap, the DOEs are expected to conduct capacity-building and enhance training activities to strengthen their internal VVC personnel competence. In accordance with the “Standard: Article 6.4 accreditation”, paragraph 44, laboratory testing and calibration may be conducted subject to a conflict-of-interest analysis outcome. Additionally, if the external expert has not engaged in such prohibited activities in at least two years, provided this time is sufficient to avoid an impartiality issue, they can be utilized as VVC personnel by a DOE and its related body.

10. The AEP interacted with the accreditation team leaders. The AEP expressed its gratitude for the hard work undertaken by the AT leaders and stated that it looked forward to such productive interactions in the future.
11. The purpose of the interaction was to facilitate an exchange of views and share experiences on the implementation of the Article 6.4 mechanism, specifically aiming to calibrate and align the conduct of the accreditation assessments and application of the accreditation requirements.

Agenda item 6. Conclusion of the meeting

12. The AEP adopted the report of AEP 009. The AEP 009 meeting report is available on the UNFCCC website.⁵
13. The Co-Chair of the AEP, Mr. Dexter Lee, closed the meeting.
14. The proceedings of the open sessions of the meeting were webcast to allow stakeholders to follow the discussion.⁶

Document information

Version	Date	Description
01.0	4 September 2026	AEP 009 meeting report. Initial publication.
Decision Class: Operational Document Type: Meeting report Business Function: Governance Keywords: AEP, reporting procedures		

⁵ See <https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/bodies/constituted-bodies/article-64-supervisory-body/accreditation-expert-panel-aep/meetings>.

⁶ See [Accreditation Expert Panel - 009 - YouTube](#).