

A6.4-SBM021-A01

Information note

Transparency arrangements for the
operations of Article 6.4 expert panels

Version 01.0



TABLE OF CONTENTS	Page
1. INTRODUCTION	3
2. PURPOSE	3
3. CURRENT PRACTICE, KEY ISSUES AND PROPOSED SOLUTIONS	3
3.1. Current practice of panel meetings including documentation and stakeholder consultation	4
3.1.1. Methodological Expert Panel	4
3.1.2. Accreditation Expert Panel.....	6
3.2. Key issues	7
3.3. Proposed solutions to enhance transparency.....	9
3.4. Inputs from the expert panel	10
4. IMPACTS.....	10
5. SUBSEQUENT WORK AND TIMELINES	10
6. BUDGET AND COSTS	11
APPENDIX 1. VIEWS OF THE PANEL MEETINGS BROADCAST	12

1. Introduction

1. The Supervisory Body of the mechanism established by Article 6, paragraph 4, of the Paris Agreement (hereinafter referred to as Article 6.4 mechanism), at its eighteenth meeting (SBM 018), requested the secretariat to prepare a concept note on governance and transparency arrangements related to the selection of the roster of experts and selection and operations of the Article 6.4 expert panels (hereinafter referred to as expert panels) for its consideration at a future meeting, including:
 - (a) Reviewing the requirements related to conflict of interest, code of conduct and confidentiality, drawing on the best practices from international standards;¹
 - (b) Proposing principles to guide the selection process, including ensuring continuity and diversity of expertise, and defining eligibility criteria that go beyond the existing performance assessment used for selecting the roster of experts and expert panels;
 - (c) Proposing rules for the re-selection of existing members of the expert panels, ensuring rotation and the onboarding of new experts, and assessing the implications of these proposed re-selection rules; and
 - (d) Exploring the possibility of web-casting the breakout sessions of the expert panel meetings to ensure transparency of its operations, as well as disclosing all relevant reference materials, including submissions by the stakeholders, for consideration of the expert panels on the dedicated UNFCCC webpage.
2. In addition, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement (CMA), at its seventh session, noting the commitment of the Supervisory Body to ensuring and enhancing the high level of transparency of its decision-making on standards, methodologies, procedures, tools and guidelines for operationalizing the Article 6.4 mechanism, requested the Supervisory Body to enhance the transparency of its decision-making and that of the Methodological Expert Panel (MEP) while safeguarding the productivity of their work.

2. Purpose

3. This information note aims to explore options to enhance transparency in the work of the Supervisory Body expert panels while safeguarding the efficiency and effectiveness of their work.
4. The information note focuses on transparency-related arrangements of the expert panels of the Supervisory Body. The governance aspects, including conflict of interest, code of conduct, confidentiality, and the selection and re-selection of expert panel members will be further developed and presented in a separate concept note for consideration by the Supervisory Body at its next meeting.

3. Current practice, key issues and proposed solutions

5. This section examines key transparency-related arrangements governing the operation of the expert panels, including the live streaming of meetings; the availability of pre-meeting

¹ Such as ISO 37009:2025.

documentation (such as annotated agendas, their annexes and presentations); the accessibility of relevant materials on the website; the publication of post-meeting documentation, including meeting reports and associated annexes; and the provision of opportunities for stakeholder consultation on relevant documents.

3.1. Current practice of panel meetings including documentation and stakeholder consultation

3.1.1. Methodological Expert Panel

6. The MEP meetings are currently live-streamed for the opening and closing plenary sessions.² Pre-meeting documents, including the annotated agenda, and in-meeting documents such as presentation delivered during the opening plenary sessions are uploaded to the panel website.³ Draft documents discussed in the closed session are not made available to the public. After MEP meetings, meeting reports and their annexes, including those related to calls for public input and recommendations to the Supervisory Body, are published on the respective website.
7. The documents published either for a call for public input or as recommendations to the Supervisory Body include detailed cover notes that provide an overview of the document's purpose and scope, along with key issues such as: (i) methodological choices, (ii) limitations, (iii) areas of further work: consideration of stakeholder comments (where applicable), and (iv) requests for policy guidance and comparison of any differences from mechanism methodologies or methodological tools under the clean development mechanism (CDM). From a transparency perspective, these cover notes are particularly helpful, as they enable readers to understand the intent, key issues and implications of the methodological product.⁴
8. The UNFCCC Article 6.4 methodologies webpage provides a centralized overview of the development, submission, and approval of methodologies.⁵ The webpage gives access to key regulatory documents, including methodology standards and procedures related to submissions of proposed mechanism methodologies, requests for revision and requests for clarification, and outlines how stakeholders can propose methodologies or methodological tools for consideration of the Supervisory Body. It also provides information on sectoral scopes and a list of approved methodologies, including key information such as applicable sectors, methodological tools that can be applied together with the methodology, and the validity of the methodology.

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

³ Sharing the presentations delivered during opening plenary is a recent enhancement of transparency practices implemented following SBM 018 and in response to the CMA mandate, demonstrating progress in strengthening openness and accessibility while appropriately safeguarding the integrity and effectiveness of technical deliberations.

⁴ For example, the cover note is elaborated in 10 pages for the draft standard for addressing non-permanence and reversals in mechanism methodologies; 26 pages for the draft methodology for flaring or use of landfill gas; and 15 pages for the draft methodological tool for emissions from electricity generation and consumption.

⁵ See <https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/the-paris-agreement/article-6/article-64-pacm/methodologies>.

9. According to the “Procedure: Development, revision and clarification of methodologies and methodological tools”⁶, stakeholders can provide input at two stages. The provisions differ between two different processes for developing methodologies or methodological tools:
- (a) **Methodologies or methodological tools developed through a top-down process:** Stakeholders consultation occur at two stages. The first takes place when a draft document is launched for public consultation as an annex to an MEP meeting report, with a consultation period of 21 days. The second occurs when the draft document is recommended by the MEP to the Supervisory Body and is included in the annotated agenda of a Supervisory Body meeting; at this stage, stakeholders may again submit comments during a seven-day consultation period. In case of the 21st meeting of the Supervisory Body, MEP recommendations were made available well in advance of Supervisory Body meetings. Therefore, an earlier consultation window (on an exceptional basis) has been provided allowing stakeholders to review draft documents and submit comments. This practice may be continued in the future provided that meeting schedules allow for this; and
 - (b) **Methodologies or methodological tools proposed through a bottom-up process:** Stakeholder consultations take place at two stages. The first occurs when a proposed methodology or methodological tool submission is considered complete following its completeness check and initial assessment by the secretariat and uploaded on the UNFCCC website for global stakeholder consultation, with a consultation period of 21 days. The second occurs when the draft document is recommended by the MEP to the Supervisory Body and is included in the annotated agenda of a Supervisory Body meeting; at this stage, stakeholders may again submit comments during a seven-day consultation period. In one case to date, the MEP also decided to launch a second call for public input on a bottom-up methodological submission (on an exceptional basis), noting that the MEP’s procedures do not foreclose additional public input and that the methodology had been changed substantially since the time of its original bottom-up submission.⁷
10. In addition to the above opportunities:
- (a) At each Supervisory Body meeting, registered observers have an opportunity to interact with the Supervisory Body to provide feedback on the recommendations made by the MEP;
 - (b) Stakeholders, at any time, may communicate directly with the Supervisory Body in accordance with the “Procedure: Direct communication with stakeholders”; and
 - (c) Supervisory Body’s meetings are live-streamed and recordings remain available, allowing stakeholders to follow the discussions on the recommendations made by the MEP.
11. Further, in accordance with the “Procedure: Direct communication with stakeholders”, the MEP may engage, during its meetings, with the Designated Operational Entity (DOE)/Applicant Entity (AE) Coordination Forum through its chair, with the forums of project developers through their chair and with any interested UNFCCC admitted observer

⁶ See <https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/A6.4-PROC-METH-001.pdf>.

⁷ See paragraph 26 of the “Draft Mechanism Methodology: N₂O abatement from nitric acid production” (A6.4-MEP012-A05):
<https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/A6.4-MEP012-A05.pdf>.

organizations. Such interactions are to be limited to policy issues relevant to the methodological standards and procedures and shall not include case-specific issues. In recent meetings, the MEP has held a number of stakeholder engagements to discuss issues relevant to the meeting agenda.

12. To enhance transparency and facilitate stakeholder engagement on methodological products under development or to facilitate understanding of stakeholders on the methodological products approved by the Supervisory Body, technical webinars focusing on methodological products are organized by the secretariat. These webinars provide an open forum for explaining the technical rationale, key elements, and practical implications of methodological products, while also allowing stakeholders to seek clarification and provide informal feedback.⁸
13. From a transparency perspective, such webinars contribute to making the methodological development process more visible and inclusive, complementing formal consultation processes as outlined in previous paragraphs. They help to bridge information gaps by translating highly technical documents into more understandable information, thereby supporting informed participation and trust in the work of the MEP.

3.1.2. Accreditation Expert Panel

14. Accreditation Expert Panel (AEP) meetings are live-streamed for the opening and closing plenary sessions.⁹ Pre-meeting documents, including the annotated agenda, are uploaded to the webpage. In-meeting documents such as presentations delivered during the opening plenary sessions are also made publicly available. Similar to the MEP, draft documents presented during the closed session are not publicly available.
15. The UNFCCC Article 6.4 accreditation webpage provides a centralized overview of the framework governing AEs and DOEs, which are responsible for validation and verification functions under the Article 6.4 mechanism.¹⁰ The webpage gives access to key regulatory documents and templates including a list of AEs and accredited DOEs, with information such as accreditation status, validation and verification functions and sectoral scopes accredited, and relevant dates on accreditation application. In addition, it shows the details of the global stakeholder consultation process, through which stakeholders can provide input on AEs, with submissions made publicly available after the consultation period (30 days).
16. In accordance with the “Procedure: Direct communication with stakeholders”, the AEP allocates time during its meetings for interaction with the DOE/AE Coordination Forum through its chair and, if the forum wishes, with a limited number of DOEs/AEs. This interaction shall be limited to policy issues relevant to the accreditation standards and

⁸ For example, the webinar organized for decoding bottom-up methodology development under Paris Agreement Crediting Mechanism held on 15 January 2026 and the one organized to elaborate further on the draft standard on addressing non-permanence and reversals held on 18 September 2025 served to increase accessibility to complex methodological content and promote a shared understanding among stakeholders. See also: <https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/bodies/constituted-bodies/article-64-supervisory-body/webinars>.

⁹ See <https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/bodies/constituted-bodies/article-64-supervisory-body/aep/meetings>.

¹⁰ See <https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/the-paris-agreement/article-6/article-64-pacm/accreditation>.

procedures and shall not include case-specific issues. In recent meetings, the AEP held a productive exchange with the chair of the DOE/AE Coordination Forum to discuss various matters, including clarifications on the implementation of specific provisions of the Article 6.4 accreditation standard.

3.2. Key issues

17. The data indicates that recordings of the MEP meetings have attracted limited numbers of views, ranging between 60 and 130 viewers per recording.¹¹ Opening plenary sessions consistently account for the majority of views, often significantly exceeding those of the closing plenary sessions. The number of views of the AEP meetings roughly mirrors the current number of AEs and DOEs which are 28 in total. (Refer to Appendix 1 for the total views and average views per recording).
18. A comparison of practices across nine carbon crediting programmes and other relevant international organizations was made, offering contextual insight into how different technical panels share information about their meetings, procedures and decisions available to stakeholders. The comparison covered elements such as the publication of meeting minutes and agendas, the extent of detail disclosed, the timeliness of reporting, and the visibility that stakeholders are afforded into governance processes.
19. Among the carbon crediting programmes and international organizations considered, transparency practices vary significantly.¹² Some provide structured summaries of governance meetings and publish a robust suite of procedural documents, while others primarily communicate through project-level updates, consultations or revisions to standards, rather than through the disclosure of meeting-specific proceedings. Across all entities, however, certain commonalities can be observed, including the general confidentiality of expert-level deliberations and the absence of published deliberations.
20. In addition, a comparative analysis of transparency practices was undertaken across eight UNFCCC Constituted Bodies and, where applicable, their associated technical or expert panels, given that not all constituted bodies have within their governance arrangements, panels comparable to the MEP and AEP. In many instances, the Constituted Body itself performs the primary technical and advisory functions, without the support of standing expert panels. In order to ensure a consistent and meaningful comparison, a range of Constituted Bodies were considered.¹³ In cases where formal panel structures were identified, the assessment focused on the transparency arrangements applicable to those panels. Conversely, where no such structures exist, transparency practices were analyzed at the level of the Constituted Body itself.
21. The analysis shows that, irrespectively of institutional structure, transparency is generally ensured through the systematic publication of agendas, technical documents and meeting reports, which provide stakeholders with visibility into the substance of discussions and

¹¹ Appendix 1 provides statistics on stakeholder viewership of the panel meeting recordings, indicating the number of views of the recorded sessions of both panels.

¹² The carbon crediting programmes and the international organizations included for the comparison are examples selected to demonstrate the range of transparency modalities currently in use, but the comparison does not claim to be exhaustive, nor does it aim to convey any evaluative judgement or preference.

¹³ The Constituted Bodies included for the comparison are selected to demonstrate the range of transparency modalities currently in use, but the comparison does not claim to be exhaustive, nor does it aim to convey any evaluative judgement or preference.

the rationale underpinning outputs. At the same time, deliberations, particularly those of a technical or sensitive nature, are typically not conducted in public, and the disclosure of detailed deliberative exchanges remains limited. Where panel structures exist, as in the case of the Executive Committee of the Warsaw International Mechanism for Loss and Damage associated with Climate Change Impacts (Excom) and the Adaptation Fund Board (AFB), similar patterns are observed, with outputs and recommendations disclosed, while technical discussions remain non-public. Overall, the prevailing approach reflects a balance between transparency, the need to protect the integrity and confidentiality of technical work, and the efficient functioning of these bodies.

22. Regarding the consideration of live-streaming of the meetings, the comparison shows none of the comparable carbon crediting programmes, international organizations and other Constituted Bodies live-stream all discussions of their meetings. When assessing the possibility of fully broadcasting the entirety of the panel's sessions, in line with the current Supervisory Body practice, the following potential benefits and risks have been identified:

(a) Potential benefits:

- (i) Could facilitate broader understanding of the technical issues under consideration, enabling Parties and stakeholders to deepen their familiarity with evolving methodological approaches;
- (ii) Could increase visibility, which could support capacity building; and
- (iii) Could establish a benchmark for transparent governance practices among carbon crediting programmes.

(b) Risks and limitations:

- (i) May introduce challenges that could affect the quality and independence of expert deliberations. Open broadcasting could discourage experts from expressing preliminary views, testing assumptions, or raising concerns freely, due to heightened visibility and the possibility of external scrutiny. This may lead to more cautious and less exploratory exchanges, ultimately affecting the robustness of methodological assessments;
- (ii) Exposes highly technical discussions to broader audiences without the necessary contextual information, increasing the risk of misinterpretation or undue pressure from interest groups;
- (iii) May present risks compromising the confidentiality of information submitted by methodology proponents, as certain agenda items may involve sensitive information, including preliminary methodological drafts or matters with potential commercial implications, which may not be suitable for public transmission; and
- (iv) Introduces practical implications associated with broadcasting, including the need for additional resources for technical infrastructure and archival management.¹⁴

¹⁴ The additional Information and communication Technology (ICT) costs associated with live streaming all MEP discussions are estimated minimum at approximately €25,000 per year.

3.3. Proposed solutions to enhance transparency

23. The secretariat considers that the current level of transparency of the panel's proceedings is appropriate and proportionate to their role within the governance structure. The panels operate as a technical advisory body, providing expert assessments and recommendations, while decision-making authority rests with the Supervisory Body. In this context, the existing transparency arrangements - particularly the publication of annotated agendas, meeting reports, annexes, and elaborated cover notes, provide stakeholders with sufficient visibility into the substance of discussions and the rationale underpinning recommendations.
24. In addition, the secretariat notes that the current approach is consistent with prevailing practices across other carbon crediting programmes and other relevant international organizations, where deliberate processes of technical bodies are generally not fully public.
25. In particular for the MEP, building on the improvements already made since SBM 018 such as the inclusion of detailed cover notes, publication of in-meeting presentations, links to call for input webpages, and integration of MEP annexes in the SBM annotations webpage, the current approach ensures a balance between transparency and the need for effective, independent and technically robust expert deliberations. In addition, much of the material considered by the MEP at early stages of its work is preliminary in nature, often comprising draft documents with incomplete sections, extensive internal annotations and iterative technical comments. Such documents are not intended for external dissemination and could not reasonably be published or discussed in a public setting without creating confusion or misinterpretation among stakeholders. The disclosure of these early-stage deliberations may therefore give rise to reputational risks for the Supervisory Body and its expert panels.
26. Further, in the case of the AEP, the nature of its work involves the assessment of individual AEs, often based on information that is commercially sensitive or competitively relevant. As such, the discussion of specific accreditation cases in an open setting may entail the disclosure of proprietary, financial or strategic information relating to those entities. This could result in commercial harm, create distortions in competition among applicants, and undermine confidence in the fairness and integrity of the accreditation process. It would therefore be inappropriate for such case-specific deliberations to take place in a public forum, and appropriate safeguards should be maintained to ensure that confidentiality is preserved while enabling the AEP to carry out its functions effectively.
27. Expanding transparency measures, such as live streaming all panel discussions, could have significant operational and procedural implications, including potential constraints on open technical exchange and increased resource requirements, without necessarily providing additional substantive value beyond what is already disclosed through formal documentation. In addition, the associated preparation and review of materials for public release would entail additional costs and administrative burdens for the secretariat and where applicable, for panel members.
28. Considering the current and foreseeable budgetary constraints of the Supervisory Body, as well as its ongoing prioritization of core operational deliverables, in particular the development and consideration of methodologies, the Supervisory Body may wish to assess the potential benefits of enhanced transparency against these operational, reputational and resource-related considerations.
29. While maintaining the current framework, the secretariat suggests the following opportunities to further enhance stakeholder understanding of panel outputs through

targeted, complementary measures as explanatory tools without introducing interpretations.

- (a) **Briefing webinars:** Continuously organizing briefing webinars on panel products where panel experts or the secretariat present and explain key recommendations, methodologies, or technical concepts. These webinars could build on the information already contained in cover notes and annexes, providing additional context and facilitating stakeholder engagement. The topics and scope of such webinars could be informed by feedback received from stakeholders, for example through the DOE/AE Coordination Forum Chair (in the case of the AEP), as well as through other channels of engagement. The secretariat could compile and analyse such inputs to identify common themes or recurring questions, thereby ensuring that the webinars are responsive to stakeholder needs and focused on areas where additional clarification is most valuable: and
- (b) **DOEs/AEs teleconference:** Continuously organizing teleconferences to update the DOEs and AEs on relevant AEP and MEP products. These sessions could build on the details and the feedback on the implementation of such products.

3.4. Inputs from the expert panel

- 30. The MEP members considered the section of transparency arrangements presented in this information note and agreed with the key issues highlighted in particular in paragraph 22 and the proposed solutions.
- 31. Furthermore, additional risks associated with live streaming all discussions at MEP meetings identified by MEP members include
 - (a) Ongoing discussions of the MEP may be commented in social media which could create confusion and misinterpretation about the status of discussions and decisions.
 - (b) It may also expose individual members to the public. Consequently, it could also expose MEP members to being approached by stakeholders or methodology proponents individually, or in the worst case, social media campaigns might be run against individual members.
- 32. The AEP members considered the section of transparency arrangements presented in this information note and agreed with the key issues highlighted in particular in paragraph 22 and the proposed solutions.

4. Impacts

- 33. This information note proposes suggestions to enhance the transparency of decision-making of the expert panels while safeguarding the productivity of their work.

5. Subsequent work and timelines

- 34. The secretariat will implement specific proposals detailed in the information note, subject to the approvals by the Supervisory Body and availability of resources¹⁵.

¹⁵ See <https://unfccc.int/documents/656932>.

6. Budget and costs

35. The proposed activities aimed at enhancing transparency may necessitate additional resources. Indicative resources already included in the 2026-2027 Resource Allocation Plan (RAP)¹⁶ for these activities are presented in the table below:

Table. Indicative resources allocation for webinars and DOE/AE teleconferences in the RAP.

Activities	Units	Person-month	non-staff costs (USD)
Support to stakeholders and capacity building of DOEs	15	5	As mentioned in RAP

¹⁶ Available at <https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/A6.4-INFO-GOV-024.pdf>

Appendix 1. Views of the panel meetings broadcast

1. The following tables provide an overview of viewership data associated with the number of clicks a broadcast of meetings of the Methodological Expert Panel (MEP) and the Accreditation Expert Panel (AEP) received.
2. The information presented reflects the number of views recorded (after the session was live) per available meeting recording, disaggregated, where applicable, between opening plenary sessions and closing plenary sessions. The data is intended to provide an indicative measure of stakeholder engagement with publicly accessible meeting proceedings.
3. It should be noted that view counts correspond to platform-based metrics per recording and may not reflect unique viewers or the duration of engagement.

Table 1. Total views of the MEP meetings

MEP meeting	Total views (per recording available)	Average views per recording
001	644 (Opening: 90, 86, 107, 277, Closing: 28, 34, 50)	92
002	298 (Opening: 108, 63, 64, Closing: 46, 17)	60
003	456 (Opening: 161, 147, Closing: 46, 102)	114
004	474 (Opening: 189, 187, Closing: 63, 35)	119
005	344 (Opening: 132, 123, Closing: 89)	115
006	240 (Opening: 100, 74, Closing: 66)	80
007	281 (Opening: 110, 107, Closing: 64)	94
008	218 (Opening: 133, Closing: 85)	109
009	122 (Opening: 76, Closing: 46)	61
010	248 (Opening: 71, 90, Closing: 87)	83
011	354 (Opening: 125, 141, Closing: 88)	118
012	260 (Opening: 195; Closing: 65)	130
013	175 (Opening: 99; Closing: 76)	88

Table 2. Total views of the AEP meetings

AEP meeting	Total views	Average views per recording
001	65 (Opening: 55, Closing: 10)	33
002	26 (Opening: 12, 13, Closing: 1)	9
003	27 (Opening: 20, Closing: 7)	14
004	34 (Opening: 23, Closing: 11)	17

AEP meeting	Total views	Average views per recording
005	48 (Opening: 25, 15, Closing: 8)	16
006	27 (Opening: 9, 10, Closing: 8)	9
007	29 (Opening: 23, Closing: 3)	15

Document information

<i>Version</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
01.0	21 May 2026	SBM 021, Annex 1. Initial adoption.

Decision Class: Operational
 Document Type: Information note
 Business Function: Governance
 Keywords: A6.4 Supervisory Body, AEP, MEP, A6.4 mechanism, panels, transparency