

A6.4-MEP016-A02

Concept note

Revision of methodological standards and
tools for application to programmes of
activities

Version 02.0



United Nations
Framework Convention on
Climate Change

TABLE OF CONTENTS	Page
1. PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND	3
2. PURPOSE	4
3. KEY ISSUES AND PROPOSED SOLUTIONS.....	5
3.1. Overview of Article 6.4 PoAs	5
3.2. Analysis of existing methodological standards and tools	6
3.3. Proposed revisions to methodological standards and tools	7
3.3.1. Additionality Standard	9
3.3.2. Baseline Standard.....	9
3.3.3. Leakage Standard.....	10
3.3.4. Suppressed Demand Standard.....	10
3.3.5. Reversals Standard	10
3.3.6. Common Practice Tool.....	10
3.3.7. Investment Analysis Tool	10
3.3.8. Lock-in Tool	10
3.3.9. Electricity Emissions Tool	10
3.4. Proposed changes to the Glossary	11
3.5. Summary of comments and responses.....	11
4. IMPACTS.....	13
5. SUBSEQUENT WORK AND TIMELINES.....	13
6. RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE SUPERVISORY BODY	16
7. APPENDICES.....	16

1. Procedural background

1. The Supervisory Body of the Article 6.4 mechanism (hereinafter referred to as the “Supervisory Body”), at its fifteenth meeting (SBM 015), requested the Methodological Expert Panel (MEP) to amend the “Standard: Demonstration of additionality in mechanism methodologies” (A6.4-STAN-METH-003, hereinafter referred to as the “additionality standard”)¹ to cover methodological requirements for activities implemented at larger scales, including programmes of activities (PoAs).²
2. The Supervisory Body, at its sixteenth meeting (SBM 016), requested the MEP to amend the “Standard: Setting the baseline in mechanism methodologies” (A6.4-STAN-METH-004, hereinafter referred to as the “baseline standard”), the “Standard: Addressing leakage in mechanism methodologies” (A6.4-STAN-METH-005, hereinafter referred to as the “leakage standard”), in addition to the additionality standard, to support the transition of PoAs into the Article 6.4 mechanism.^{3,4,5}
3. The Supervisory Body, at its twenty-first meeting (SBM 021), requested the MEP to prepare a concept note on revising methodological standards and tools for application to Article 6.4 programmes of activities and to propose any revisions to relevant methodological standards and tools needed to make them applicable to Article 6.4 PoAs, including, inter alia:⁶
 - (a) Additionality standard;
 - (b) Baseline standard;
 - (c) Leakage standard;
 - (d) “Standard: Addressing suppressed demand in mechanism methodologies” (A6.4-STAN-METH-006, hereinafter referred to as the “suppressed demand standard”);⁷
 - (e) “Standard: Addressing non-permanence and reversals in mechanism methodologies” (A6.4-STAN-METH-007, hereinafter referred to as the “reversals standard”);⁸
 - (f) “Methodological tool: Common practice analysis” (A6.4-AMT-001, hereinafter referred to as the “common practice tool”);⁹ and

¹ See <https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/A6.4-STAN-METH-003.pdf>.

² See paragraph 39(d) of A6.4-SBM015, <https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/A6.4-SBM015.pdf/>.

³ See <https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/A6.4-STAN-METH-004.pdf>.

⁴ See <https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/A6.4-STAN-METH-005.pdf>.

⁵ See paragraphs 13 and 32 of A6.4-SBM016, <https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/A6.4-SBM016.pdf>.

⁶ See paragraph 27 of A6.4-SBM021, <https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/A6.4-SBM021.pdf>.

⁷ See <https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/A6.4-STAN-METH-006.pdf>.

⁸ See <https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/A6.4-STAN-METH-007.pdf>.

⁹ See <https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/the-paris-agreement/article-6/article-64-pacm/mechanism-process/methodologies/a64-amt-001>.

- (g) “Methodological tool: Investment analysis” (A6.4-AMT-002, hereinafter referred to as the “investment analysis tool”).¹⁰
4. The MEP, at its fourteenth meeting (MEP 014), prepared the draft “Concept note: Revision of methodological standards and tools for application to programmes of activities” (A6.4-MEP014-A02),¹¹ including as appendices the seven draft revised methodological standards and tools quoted in the paragraph above and an eighth draft revised “Methodological Tool: Analysis of lock-in risk” (A6.4-AMT-008, hereinafter referred to as the “lock-in tool”)¹², and agreed to seek public input from stakeholders. The public consultation was open from 3 to 24 July 2026, and a total of 69 inputs from 15 submitters were received on the draft concept note and its eight appendices.
 5. The MEP, at its fifteenth meeting (MEP 015), prepared a draft revised version of the “Methodological tool: Emissions from electricity generation and consumption” (A6.4-AMT-007, hereinafter referred to as the “electricity emissions tool”) to extend its application to PoAs (A6.4-MEP015-A02)¹³ and agreed to seek public inputs from stakeholders. The public consultation was open from 29 July to 19 August 2026, and five comments from one submitter were received. The draft revised electricity emissions tool is included as appendix 9 to this concept note.
 6. A summary of how these comments were addressed in the draft revised methodological standards and tools is provided in section 3.5 of this concept note.

2. Purpose

7. The Article 6.4 mechanism’s existing methodological standards and several of its methodological tools were designed for, and are currently applicable only to, Article 6.4 activities undertaken at the project level. Accordingly, these methodological standards and tools do not permit the approval of mechanism methodologies that apply to Article 6.4 PoAs. Some also contain technical requirements that require revision to address features specific to Article 6.4 PoAs.
8. The proposed changes to the methodological standards and tools are intended to enable the Supervisory Body to approve and operationalize mechanism methodologies that apply to Article 6.4 PoAs, including PoAs transitioning to the Article 6.4 mechanism.
9. The MEP notes that two draft mechanism methodologies recommended by the MEP for consideration by the Supervisory Body at its 23rd meeting are expected to be applicable to PoAs transitioning to the Article 6.4 mechanism:
 - (a) The draft “Methodology: Energy efficiency measures in household cooking” (A6.4-MEP016-A03)¹⁴ (which may replace, in part, CDM Methodology AMS-II-G.); and

¹⁰ See <https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/the-paris-agreement/article-6/article-64-pacm/mechanism-process/methodologies/a64-amt-002>.

¹¹ See <https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/A6.4-MEP014-A02.pdf>.

¹² See <https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/the-paris-agreement/article-6/article-64-pacm/mechanism-process/methodologies/a64-amt-008>.

¹³ See <https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/A6.4-MEP015-A02.pdf>.

¹⁴ See <https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/A6.4-MEP013-A02.pdf>.

- (b) The draft “Methodology: Cooking energy transitions” (A6.4-MEP016-A01)¹⁵ (which may replace, in part, CDM Methodology AMS-I.E.).

3. Key issues and proposed solutions

3.1. Overview of Article 6.4 PoAs

10. An Article 6.4 PoA is a voluntary coordinated action that leads to emission reductions or net removals through an unlimited number of component projects (CPs), each of which is a single measure, or a set of interrelated measures, to reduce GHG emissions or result in net GHG removals. An Article 6.4 PoA is structured as follows:
- (a) For each PoA, activity participants must submit a programme of activities design document (PoA-DD), which describes the scope of the PoA, the activity type(s) eligible for inclusion in the PoA, the geographical boundary(ies) of the PoA, and applicable mechanism methodology(ies) and methodological tool(s) to be used;
 - (b) Each PoA-DD includes a section describing one or more generic component projects (each, a generic CP). A generic CP represents a type of CP eligible for inclusion in the PoA with similar attributes that are eligible for inclusion in the PoA (e.g., CPs that apply the same technology/measure, use the same methodology, or are located in the same geographical boundary); and
 - (c) In order to include an eligible CP in a registered PoA, activity participants must submit a component project design document (CP-DD), prepared based on exactly one of the generic CPs provided in the PoA-DD.
11. The following terms are used in this concept note. For some terms, the MEP notes that more comprehensive and formal definitions are provided in the “Glossary: Article 6.4 mechanism terms” (A6.4-GLOS-GOV-001, hereinafter referred to as the “glossary”).¹⁶ The abbreviated definitions provided here are intended to clarify the relationship among technical concepts related to Article 6.4 PoAs and are not intended to replace existing definitions:
- (a) **Article 6.4 activity:** refers jointly to Article 6.4 projects and Article 6.4 PoAs;¹⁷
 - (b) **Article 6.4 project:** a voluntary, stand-alone project under the Article 6.4 mechanism;¹⁸
 - (c) **Article 6.4 programme of activities (Article 6.4 PoA):** a voluntary, coordinated action to implement one or more similarly situated component projects (CPs) under the Article 6.4 mechanism;
 - (d) **Component project (CP):** a single measure or set of interrelated measures included as part of an Article 6.4 PoA;

¹⁵ See <https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/A6.4-MEP015-A01.pdf>.

¹⁶ See <https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/A6.4-Glossary.pdf>.

¹⁷ This definition does not include component project(s) (CPs).

¹⁸ This definition also does not include CPs.

- (e) **Component project design document (CP-DD):** a design document for a component project, that corresponds to exactly one of the generic CP(s) provided for in a PoA-DD;
- (f) **Generic component project (generic CP):** a category of CPs provided for in an Article 6.4 PoA that share similar attributes (e.g., a common activity type and geographical scope). A generic CP is not described in a stand-alone document, but forms part of the PoA-DD;
- (g) **Programme of activities design document (PoA-DD):** a design document for an Article 6.4 PoA, which includes a section describing one or more generic CPs; and
- (h) **Project design document (PDD):** a design document for an Article 6.4 project.

3.2. Analysis of existing methodological standards and tools

12. The MEP agreed to analyse the methodological standards and tools listed in Table 1 to determine whether each methodological standard or tool is:
 - (a) Already applicable to Article 6.4 PoAs; and
 - (b) Required to support the implementation of mechanism methodologies that reduce non-renewable biomass consumption (e.g., the draft mechanism methodologies referred to in paragraph 9 above).

Table 1. Applicability of methodological standards and tools to Article 6.4 PoAs

Methodological standard or tool	Applicable to Article 6.4 PoAs?	Necessary for the draft mechanism methodologies referred to in paragraph 9
Additionality standard	No	Yes
Baseline standard	No	Yes
Leakage standard	No	Yes
Suppressed demand standard	No	Yes
Reversals standard	No	Yes
Common practice tool	No	Yes
Investment analysis tool	No	Yes
Lock-in tool	Yes ¹⁹	Yes ²⁰
"Methodological tool: Project emissions from flaring" (A6.4-AMT-004) ²¹	No	No

¹⁹ The lock-in tool was drafted to be applicable to Article 6.4 PoAs. However, revisions are considered necessary to align it with the proposed revisions to the Additionality Standard.

²⁰ Although the MEP determined that this methodological tool is not necessary to support the implementation of the draft mechanism methodologies referred to in paragraph 9, the MEP also determined the revisions necessary to make the methodological tool applicable to Article 6.4 PoAs as part of its work on updating the additionality standard. Accordingly, proposed revisions to this methodological tool are included in this concept note.

²¹ See <https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/the-paris-agreement/article-6/article-64-pacm/mechanism-process/methodologies/a64-amt-004>.

"Methodological tool: Mass flow of a greenhouse gas in a gaseous stream" (A6.4-AMT-005) ²²	No	No
"Methodological tool: Determination of the technical lifetime of equipment" (A6.4-AMT-006) ²³	No	No
"Methodological tool: Emissions from electricity generation and consumption" (A6.4-AMT-007) ²⁴	No	Yes
"Methodological tool: Fraction of non-renewable biomass" (A6.4-AMT-009) ²⁵	Yes	Yes

13. Accordingly, the MEP determined that, to support the operationalization of mechanism methodologies applicable to Article 6.4 PoAs that reduce non-renewable biomass consumption, it is necessary to prioritize revisions to the following methodological standards and tools to make them applicable to Article 6.4 PoAs:
- (a) Additionality standard (provisions in appendix 1);
 - (b) Baseline standard (provisions in appendix 2);
 - (c) Leakage standard (provisions in appendix 3);
 - (d) Suppressed demand standard (provisions in appendix 4);
 - (e) Reversals standard (provisions in appendix 5);
 - (f) Common practice tool (provisions in appendix 6);
 - (g) Investment analysis tool (provisions in appendix 7);
 - (h) Lock-in tool (provisions in appendix 8); and
 - (i) Electricity emissions tool (provisions in appendix 9).
14. The MEP identified that some of the terms contained in the glossary would need to be revised. Table 2 in section 3.4 provides a list of the proposed changes for consideration by the Supervisory Body.

3.3. Proposed revisions to methodological standards and tools

15. For all revised methodological standards and tools, the applicability statement is revised to read: "This version of the standard is applicable to proposed mechanism methodologies for Article 6.4 projects and Article 6.4 programme of activities (PoA), jointly referred to as

²² See <https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/the-paris-agreement/article-6/article-64-pacm/mechanism-process/methodologies/a64-amt-005>.

²³ See <https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/the-paris-agreement/article-6/article-64-pacm/mechanism-process/methodologies/a64-amt-006-determination-of-the-technical-lifetime-of-equipment>.

²⁴ See <https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/the-paris-agreement/article-6/article-64-pacm/mechanism-process/methodologies/a64-amt-007-emissions-from-electricity-generation-and-consumption>.

²⁵ See <https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/the-paris-agreement/article-6/article-64-pacm/mechanism-process/methodologies/a64-amt-009>.

Article 6.4 activities”. The proposed revisions make the methodological standards and tools applicable to both Article 6.4 projects and Article 6.4 PoAs. References to relevant rules pertaining to PoAs are also included, where applicable, together with other editorial revisions.

16. For all revised methodological standards and tools, the MEP evaluated the original use of the terms “Article 6.4 activity” (and derivations thereof) and either:
 - (a) Retained the original term where it refers to an Article 6.4 activity in a generic manner, regardless of whether the Article 6.4 activity is an Article 6.4 project or PoA. The MEP notes that the use of this term is not appropriate for any reference to a CP in the case of a PoA, but is appropriate for referring generically to a PoA; or
 - (b) Replaced the original term with “Article 6.4 projects or CPs” where the reference requires consideration of CP-specific matters in the case of Article 6.4 PoAs.
17. Consistent with paragraph 16 above, the proposed revisions specify if the requirements of the standard, when relevant, shall be addressed at the level of the:
 - (a) Article 6.4 activity (i.e., an Article 6.4 project or PoA); or
 - (b) Article 6.4 project or CP (i.e., not at the level of an Article 6.4 PoA).
18. Although the MEP was able to complete the steps described in paragraphs 16 and 17 of this concept note for nearly all applications, the MEP identified a provision that may require input from the Supervisory Body. Specifically, the MEP noted that the provisions of paragraphs 16 and 17 of the draft version 2.0 of the leakage standard, which address matters related to REDD+ activities, may have different meanings depending on whether these provisions apply to an “Article 6.4 activity” (meaning either an Article 6.4 project or an Article 6.4 PoA) or an “Article 6.4 project or activity” (referring to each individual CP in the context of an Article 6.4 PoA rather than the Article 6.4 PoA as a whole). This is because the applicable REDD+ elements are implemented by host Parties, which is relevant because multi-national Article 6.4 PoAs can span two host Parties that have taken different approaches to implementing REDD+ measures. For example, consider a multi-national Article 6.4 PoA that has CPs in two different host Parties, host Party A (which has taken the required actions with respect to the CPs in its territory) and host Party B (which has not). In this example, the MEP notes that:
 - (a) Applying the requirements of paragraphs 16 and 17 of version 2.0 of the leakage standard to an “Article 6.4 activity” would mean that the CPs located in host Party A would not satisfy these requirements until both host Parties take the required actions; and
 - (b) Applying the same requirements to an “Article 6.4 project or CP” would mean that the CPs located in host Party A would satisfy these requirements, independent of host Party B’s approach to REDD+ implementation.
19. In addition, the terminology was aligned with that referred to in paragraph 11 above. Specifically, where the term “PDD” is used, it has either been retained (where it refers only to an Article 6.4 project) or expanded, as appropriate, to include “PoA-DD” and “CP-DD”. Other editorial revisions were also made, such as replacing the term “project” with “activity” where it refers to an Article 6.4 activity. In other contexts, the term “project” was retained where appropriate.

20. Proposed revisions to the methodological standards and tools are summarized for each document in the subsections below.

3.3.1. Additionality Standard

21. For the additionality standard, in addition to expanding its applicability to Article 6.4 PoAs, the proposed revisions require mechanism methodologies applicable to PoAs to adopt one of three approaches below, where each approach defines the level at which additionality must be demonstrated:
- (a) Require each CP to demonstrate additionality following the same requirements for demonstrating additionality of Article 6.4 projects;
 - (b) Establish standardized requirements for how activity participants shall define, in the generic component project of the PoA-DD, the eligibility criteria for including a CP in the PoA that enable each CP to demonstrate additionality by fulfilling these criteria; or
 - (c) Define eligibility criteria at the level of the mechanism methodology that enables each CP to demonstrate additionality directly by fulfilling these criteria.
22. Consistent with the provisions for Article 6.4 projects, the standard was revised to clarify that where the investment analysis is applied by CPs in the CP-DD and the CP is included in the Article 6.4 PoA prior to the start date of the CP, the investment analysis shall be updated through the submission by the DOE of a notification of post-registration change prior to the first verification.

3.3.2. Baseline Standard

23. In addition to expanding its applicability to Article 6.4 PoAs, the proposed revisions to the baseline standard require mechanism methodologies applicable to PoAs to specify how activity participants in Article 6.4 PoAs establish the baseline scenario and the business-as-usual (BAU) scenario in the context of the PoA. Specifically, the revised standard prescribes three options in this regard, discussed below. Further, procedures specific to Article 6.4 PoAs (i.e., inclusion of CPs) are included in the appendix.
24. In determining the baseline and the BAU scenarios in the context of Article 6.4 PoAs, mechanism methodologies shall include requirements by either:
- (a) Requiring each CP to determine the baseline and BAU scenarios following the same requirements for determining the baseline and BAU scenarios for Article 6.4 projects;
 - (b) Establishing standardized requirements for how activity participants shall determine, in the generic component project of the PoA-DD, the eligibility criteria for including a CP in the PoA that enable each CP to determine its applicable baseline and BAU scenarios; or
 - (c) Defining eligibility criteria at the level of the mechanism methodology that enables each CP to determine the baseline and BAU scenarios directly by fulfilling these criteria.

25. Mechanism methodologies applying the baseline standard to Article 6.4 PoAs may include additional requirements for how to quantify baseline emissions or removals and emission reductions or net removals in the context of Article 6.4 PoAs.

3.3.3. Leakage Standard

26. In addition to expanding its applicability to Article 6.4 PoAs, the proposed revisions to the leakage standard indicate that mechanism methodologies applicable to PoAs may include additional requirements for identifying and quantifying leakage emissions in the context of Article 6.4 PoAs, as necessary.

3.3.4. Suppressed Demand Standard

27. In addition to expanding its applicability to Article 6.4 PoAs, the proposed revisions to the suppressed demand standard indicate that mechanism methodologies applicable to PoAs may include additional requirements for addressing suppressed demand in the context of Article 6.4 PoAs, as necessary.

3.3.5. Reversals Standard

28. In addition to expanding its applicability to Article 6.4 PoAs, the proposed revisions to the reversals standard require mechanism methodologies applicable to PoAs to apply the “Methodological tool: Reversal Risk Assessment” to each CP.

3.3.6. Common Practice Tool

29. In addition to expanding its applicability to Article 6.4 PoAs, the proposed revisions to the common practice tool clarify that the methodological tool follows the approach in paragraph 10(a) of the draft version 4.0 of the additionality standard (as proposed in paragraph 21 above). The proposed revisions also provide additional criteria for the identification and exclusion of comparable activities for CPs in the context of Article 6.4 PoAs.

3.3.7. Investment Analysis Tool

30. In addition to expanding its applicability to Article 6.4 PoAs, the proposed revisions to the investment analysis tool clarify that the methodological tool follows the approach in paragraph 10(a) of the draft version 4.0 of the additionality standard (as proposed in paragraph 21 above). The proposed revisions also provide additional guidance on updating the data used in the investment analysis for CPs in the context of Article 6.4 PoAs.

3.3.8. Lock-in Tool

31. In addition to expanding its applicability to Article 6.4 PoAs, the proposed revisions to the lock-in tool clarify that the methodological tools follow the approach in paragraph 10(a) of draft version 4.0 of the additionality standard (as proposed in paragraph 21 above).

3.3.9. Electricity Emissions Tool

32. In addition to expanding its applicability to Article 6.4 PoAs, the proposed revisions also provide guidance for the data vintages used in the context of Article 6.4 PoAs to calculate the operating margin emission factor under the ex-ante option in the methodological tool.

3.4. Proposed changes to the Glossary

33. The table below reflects changes and amendments to the “Glossary: Article 6.4 mechanism terms” (A6.4-GLOS-GOV-001) that the MEP recommends the Supervisory Body to incorporate in the document.

Table 2. Proposed changes and amendments to the “Glossary: Article 6.4 mechanism terms” (A6.4-GLOS-GOV-001)

Term	Proposed revision
Applicability conditions	Conditions that specify contexts, configurations and cases in which a mechanism methodology can be applied to a proposed Article 6.4 activity project or CP while ensuring environmental integrity
Best Available Technology	The practice or technology in a given scope that: (a) provides a similar output as the Article 6.4 activity project or CP ; (b) represents an economically feasible and environmentally sound course of action; (c) is available in the baseline geographical area, meaning accessible off the shelf, or via a tendering or direct contracting process, or by direct implementation by an end user within the boundary of potential Article 6.4 activity project or CP ; and (d) results in the lowest emissions or largest removals per unit of output among all practices and/or technologies that fulfil the conditions (i) to (iii)
Business as usual	Plausible reference benchmark or scenario for GHG emissions or removals prior to or in the absence of the implementation of the proposed Article 6.4 activity project or CP . It may be at a scenario, emission or removal level, or an emissions or removals intensity.
Crediting baseline	The reference emissions or removals level against which the volume of emission reductions or net removals achieved by the Article 6.4 activity project or CP is quantified
Crediting deficit	A net increase in GHG emissions resulting from an Article 6.4 activity project or CP caused by factors other than reversals
Level of service	The quality, reliability and scale of an output provided by an Article 6.4 activity project or CP and/or in the baseline scenario, as specified in the mechanism methodology
Output	Each good or service provided by the Article 6.4 activity project or CP in the activity scenario and/or in the baseline scenario, as specified in the mechanism methodology
Related sources, sinks and reservoirs	GHG sources, sinks and reservoirs that have material or energy flows into, out of, or within the Article 6.4 activity project or CP

34. The MEP also recommends the Supervisory Body to include the definitions of “Article 6.4 project” and “Generic component project (Generic CP)” in the glossary.

3.5. Summary of comments and responses

35. This sub-section summarizes how substantive comments were addressed.
36. The MEP undertook a comprehensive assessment of all 69 inputs received and observed that none were made to the changes proposed to the methodological standards and methodological tools, which are limited to changes necessary to make the methodological standards and tools applicable to Article 6.4 PoAs as well as non-substantive editorial matters. Therefore, these proposals were not incorporated into the draft revised

methodological standards and tools because they are related to matters that extend beyond the scope of the MEP's current mandate. Such comments include, for example:

- (a) Providing additional guidance for methodologies to address international leakage in the leakage standard;
- (b) The development of additional criteria on baseline setting performance-based approaches, and the standardization of the geographical area for the BAU scenario in the baseline standard;
- (c) Including one set of objectives and ex-ante verifiable eligibility criteria for inclusion of CPs in a PoA for each combination of project activity, geographic area (if applicable), baseline scenario, and additionality demonstration;
- (d) Including language on subsequent work for application to PoAs for nature-based activities;
- (e) Including specific provisions in the reversals standard related to, among others, carbon-stock changes, buffer pool contributions, the permanence of certain activities such as clean cooking, exemptions from monitoring and reporting obligations, quantification of reversals, and alternative reversal-risk-management mechanisms;
- (f) Proposing a threshold for the level of service for meeting basic human needs in the suppressed demand standard;
- (g) Proposing a new threshold for the common practice analysis for a specific type of activity and recommending excluding activities registered under other GHG crediting programmes/standards from the cohort of comparable activities in the common practice tool;
- (h) Proposing a new approach to determine the operating margin (OM) emission factor in the electricity emissions tool; and
- (i) Revising the additionality standard by not enforcing mechanism methodologies to require activity participants to conduct the regulatory analysis and the analysis of lock-in risk.

37. The MEP also observed that some of the proposals, although not aligned with the scope of the mandate, may have merit for being considered in future work on the revision and development of these methodological standards and tools and agreed to take note of them. Such comments include:

- (a) Requiring activity participants to demonstrate, in the baseline standard, that the baseline scenario determined in a standardized manner at the level of the Article 6.4 PoA is valid for the entirety of each geographical area to which it applies, and that the geographical area shall be redefined or subdivided accordingly where such validity cannot be demonstrated; and
- (b) Indicating, in the leakage standard, that mechanism methodologies applying the standard to Article 6.4 PoAs may include additional and/or differentiated requirements for identifying and quantifying leakage emissions in the context of Article 6.4 PoAs, as necessary.

4. Impacts

38. The proposed revisions to the methodological standards and tools to incorporate PoA-specific requirements will enable the development and implementation of mechanism methodologies applicable to Article 6.4 PoAs.
39. Specifically, the proposed revisions to the methodological standards and tools will enable the Supervisory Body to approve and operationalize the draft mechanism methodologies referred to in paragraph 9 above.

5. Subsequent work and timelines

40. Subsequent work may be needed to:
- (a) Identify elements of the “Information note: Elements related to non-permanence and reversals for inclusion in relevant regulatory documents” (A6.4-INFO-METH-002)²⁶ that apply to project-level activity participants and adapt them for Article 6.4 PoAs, for example by amending the “Procedure: Article 6.4 activity cycle procedure for programmes of activities” (A6.4-PROC-AC-003)²⁷ (e.g., to specify how activity participants shall monitor, report, and remediate reversals related to CPs); and
 - (b) Incorporate the proposed revisions to the methodological standards and tools into an updated version of the “Standard: Article 6.4 activity standard for programmes of activities” (A6.4-STAN-AC-004) and the “Procedure: Activity cycle procedure for Article 6.4 Programme of activities” (A6.4-PROC-AC-003), as appropriate.²⁸
41. The MEP notes that the changes referred to in paragraph 40 are not required to approve mechanism methodologies applicable to Article 6.4 PoAs.
42. The MEP notes that the following methodological tools require further revision before they are applicable to Article 6.4 PoAs:
- (a) “Methodological tool: Emissions from solid waste disposal site” (A6.4-AMT-003);
 - (b) “Methodological tool: Project emissions from flaring” (A6.4-AMT-004);
 - (c) “Methodological tool: Mass flow of a greenhouse gas in a gaseous stream” (A6.4-AMT-005); and
 - (d) “Methodological tool: Determination of the technical lifetime of equipment” (A6.4-AMT-006).
43. The MEP further notes that the following approved mechanism methodologies are currently only applicable to Article 6.4 projects and would need to be revised to be applicable to Article 6.4 PoAs:

²⁶ See <https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/A6.4-INFO-METH-002.pdf>.

²⁷ See <https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/A6.4-PROC-AC-003.pdf>.

²⁸ See <https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/A6.4-STAN-AC-004.pdf>.

- (a) “Mechanism methodology: Flaring or use of landfill gas” (A6.4-AMM-001);²⁹
 - (b) “Mechanism methodology: N₂O abatement from nitric acid production” (A6.4-AMM-002);³⁰ and
 - (c) “Mechanism methodology: Electricity generation from renewable sources connected to an electricity system” (A6.4-AMM-003).³¹
44. Whereas no PoA was identified for A6.4-AMM-002 (see table 3), subsequent work may therefore also include a revision of the mechanism methodologies A6.4-AMM-001 and A6.4-AMM-003 to make them applicable to PoAs.
45. Further, following the mandate from SBM 021 requesting the MEP to revise any relevant methodological standards and tools to make them applicable to programmes of activities (as referenced in paragraph 3 above), the MEP agreed to revise the mechanism methodologies and methodological tools:
- (a) “Mechanism methodology: Flaring or use of landfill gas” (A6.4-AMM-001);
 - (b) “Mechanism methodology: Electricity generation from renewable sources connected to an electricity system” (A6.4-AMM-003);
 - (c) “Methodological tool: Emissions from solid waste disposal site” (A6.4-AMT-003);
 - (d) “Methodological tool: Project emissions from flaring” (A6.4-AMT-004);
 - (e) “Methodological tool: Mass flow of a greenhouse gas in a gaseous stream” (A6.4-AMT-005); and
 - (f) “Methodological tool: Determination of the technical lifetime of equipment” (A6.4-AMT-006).

²⁹ See <https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/the-paris-agreement/article-6/article-64-pacm/mechanism-process/methodologies/a64-amm-001>.

³⁰ See <https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/the-paris-agreement/article-6/article-64-pacm/mechanism-process/methodologies/a64-amm-002>.

³¹ See <https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/the-paris-agreement/article-6/article-64-pacm/mechanism-process/methodologies/a64-amm-003>.

Table 3. Number of CDM project activities, PoAs and CPAs in different stages of the transition process that can apply the mechanism methodologies A6.4-AMM-001 and A6.4-AMM-003

CDM methodologies	Pending additional documentation			Transition fee pending			Substantive check completed			Assessment in progress			Registered			TOTAL		
	Project	PoA	CPA	Project	PoA	CPA	Project	PoA	CPA	Project	PoA	CPA	Project	PoA	CPA	Project	PoA	CPA
ACM0001	45	3	12	-	1	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	46	4	15
ACM0002	125	6	38	5	1	5	1	-	-	7	-	-	5	-	-	143	7	43
ACM0002; AMS-I.D.	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
AMS-I.D.	34	5	24	1	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	37	5	24
AMS-I.F.; AMS-I.D.	-	1	1 ^(a)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
AMS-I.F.; AMS-I.D.; ACM0002	-	2	36 ^(b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	36
AMS-III.G.	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	-

^(a) The CPA applies the CDM methodology “AMS-I.F.: Renewable electricity generation for captive use and mini-grid”.

^(b) 31 out of these 36 CPs apply the CDM methodology “AMS-I.D.: Grid connected renewable electricity generation”, whereas the remaining 5 CPs apply the CDM methodology “ACM0002: Grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources”.

6. Recommendations to the Supervisory Body

46. The MEP agreed to recommend that the Supervisory Body:
- (a) Consider this concept note and adopt the draft revised methodological standards and tools included as appendices;
 - (b) Review the matter identified in paragraph 18 above, select which of the two approaches is appropriate for revising paragraphs 16 and 17 of version 2.0 of the “Standard: Addressing leakage in mechanism methodologies” (A6.4-STAN-METH-005), and request the secretariat to implement appropriate technical and editorial changes to implement the selected approach; and
 - (c) Consider the proposed changes in Table 2 above to the “Glossary: Article 6.4 mechanism terms” (A6.4-GLOS-GOV-001) and request the secretariat to update the Glossary, taking into account the definitions referenced in paragraph 11 of this cover note.

7. Appendices

47. List of appendices:
- (a) Appendix 1. Draft Standard: Demonstration of additionality in mechanism methodologies (version 4.0);
 - (b) Appendix 2. Draft Standard: Setting the baseline in mechanism methodologies (version 3.0);
 - (c) Appendix 3. Draft Standard: Addressing leakage in mechanism methodologies (version 3.0);
 - (d) Appendix 4. Draft Standard: Addressing suppressed demand in mechanism methodologies” (version 3.0);
 - (e) Appendix 5. Draft Standard: Addressing non-permanence and reversals in mechanism methodologies (version 3.0);
 - (f) Appendix 6. Draft Methodological Tool: Common practice analysis (version 3.0);
 - (g) Appendix 7. Draft Methodological Tool: Investment analysis (version 3.0);
 - (h) Appendix 8. Draft Methodological Tool: Analysis of lock-in risk (version 3.0); and
 - (i) Appendix 9. Draft Methodological Tool: Emissions from electricity generation and consumption (version 3.0).

Document information

<i>Version</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
02.0	18 September 2026	MEP 016, Annex 2. To be considered by the A6.4 Supervisory Body at SBM 023. This version takes into accounts the inputs received in response to the call for input on this draft document
01.0	2 July 2026	MEP 014, Annex 02. A call for input on this document will be issued following the conclusion of MEP 014 meeting. The input received will be considered by the MEP for the further development of this document at a future meeting.

Decision Class: Regulatory

Document Type: Information note

Business Function: Methodology

Keywords: A6.4 mechanism, management of official documentation, methodologies, programmes of activities
