



Reporting Information on Each Cooperative Approach: Paragraph 18(g)-(i)

24 April 2023

Molly Peters-Stanley
US State Department

It is crucial that materials, programs, and tools for Initial Report submissions account for context (1)

- Information in paragraph 18(g)-(i) is crucial to TACC and broad understanding of cooperative approaches.
- In the information in paragraph 18(g)-(i), a Party summarizes how *each* cooperative approach is consistent with key principles in Article 6:
 - Contribution to higher ambition in mitigation and adaptation actions
 - Environmental Integrity
 - Sustainable development
 - Transparency, including transparent governance
 - ...and in articulation of these principles throughout 2/CMA.3
- A manual should practically advance Parties' capacity for, and TACC and robustness of, IR submissions—not create new requirements.

It is crucial that materials, programs, and tools for Initial Report submissions account for context (2)

1. Information sources may/not be administered by a Party.
 - **Direct/own source:** Some Parties will develop their own market mechanisms or measures
 - **Indirect/outside source:** Some Parties will use independent market mechanisms or measures
2. Coordinated submissions are not always possible or required.
3. Authorization formats, frequency, specificity (including entities) will vary given range of measures underpinning cooperation globally.
 - **Mechanism-level:** Authorizing MOs from “ETS A” or “Mechanism A”, potentially within stated parameters or conditions (*authorization frequency: low*)
 - **Activity-level:** Authorizing MOs on activity-by-activity basis, e.g., at registration, renewal (*authorization frequency: moderate*)
 - **Unit-level:** Authorizing MOs at unit- or batch-level, e.g., upon each request for issuance (*authorization frequency: potentially high*)

Participating Parties may encounter challenges to fulfilling IR requirements in a compatible manner.

TOPIC	DESCRIPTION, e.g.,
1. PROCESS	When, how, where to submit IR (<i>in plain language</i>)
2. FORMAT	If IR refers to weblinks, how is relevant info archived? How are attachments appended / submitted?
3. DEPTH/DETAIL	How could quantified information be formatted? How could complex / multi-layered questions be addressed? How much detail to summarize vs. refer to elsewhere?
4. CAPACITY	What steps could Party take to ensure information is / will be available, consistent, accurate? How could information compilation and consistency be supported?
5. RELEVANCE	How can the contents of IRs (their TACC and present-day relevance) be enhanced over time?

1. PROCESS: Notional examples could help answer questions like, “*What* constitutes an authorization?”

- IRs are submitted “no later than the authorization of ITMOs” under a cooperative approach. Presumably, the same goes for any further approaches—the latter through *updated* IRs (4/CMA.3, para. 18(g)).
 - **EXAMPLE:** For purposes of IR submission, an “authorization” could involve the Party’s public provision, publication, or other communication of the authorization of a cooperative approach in a letter, memorandum, or other format (e.g., web-based indication) and may/not specify authorized ITMOs and/or activities. Regarding the latter, a Party is reminded that, upon submitting an IR, it must annually submit an AEF to the Article 6 Database containing annual information on ITMO authorization and transfers under each cooperative approach.
- Upon IR submission, Parties report on ITMO authorizations, transfers under each cooperative approach by 15 April of “the following year”
 - **EXAMPLE:** Year 1: Authorized ITMOs are first-transferred; Year 2: By April 15, submit AEF for recording in A6 Database describing ITMO authorizations, transferred amounts under each cooperative approach.

1. PROCESS: A Manual could also help clarify / caution against approaches that challenge TACC.

- In BTRs, Parties can **update** information that was previously reported in IRs—in sections II and III of Regular Information (6/CMA.4, Annex VI)
- **EXAMPLE:**
 - Updated IRs should only be used to submit information on a further cooperative approach that has not been submitted in a previous IR within the given NDC timeframe (i.e., a newly initiated cooperative approach).
 - If the Party needs to amend, supplement, or clarify information regarding a cooperative approach that is referred to in a previous IR or Updated IR, such updates should only be submitted in sections II and/or III of Regular Information in BTRs, not through the submission of an updated IRs.

2. FORMAT: A Manual could use a combination of examples and instructions to mitigate challenges.

TOPIC	DESCRIPTION
ATTACHMENTS	<p>May address different authorization scenarios, formats, e.g.,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Instructions for attaching “letters” or comparable formats AND/OR (?)• Instructions for authorizations involving greater specificity or frequency, e.g., in such instances...<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Attach cooperative approach-level authorization and/or comparable summary information to IR• Specify authorized ITMOs in AEF
WEBLINKS	<p>May request that any web-linked information is also, e.g.,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• captured through screen-shots and/or downloaded and• submitted as additional attachments to enable long-term access to decision-critical information.

3. DEPTH / DETAIL: Tools, tables, notional examples could help IRs respond to evolving best practices (1)

TOPIC	DESCRIPTION																		
<p>FORMATS</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tables, e.g., for quantitative information <table border="1" data-bbox="784 589 2333 761"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="6" data-bbox="784 589 2333 644">IV. D. Expected mitigation for each year of the duration of the cooperative approach (para. 18(g))</th> </tr> <tr> <th data-bbox="784 644 1067 701">YEAR =></th> <th data-bbox="1067 644 1352 701">2023</th> <th data-bbox="1352 644 1638 701">2024</th> <th data-bbox="1638 644 1923 701">2025</th> <th data-bbox="1923 644 2091 701">2026</th> <th data-bbox="2091 644 2333 701">2027 (etc...)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="784 701 1067 761">Est. mitigation</td> <td data-bbox="1067 701 1352 761">8-10 MtCO_{2e}</td> <td data-bbox="1352 701 1638 761">10-12 MtCO_{2e}</td> <td data-bbox="1638 701 1923 761">10-12 MtCO_{2e}</td> <td data-bbox="1923 701 2091 761">N/A</td> <td data-bbox="2091 701 2333 761">N/A</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	IV. D. Expected mitigation for each year of the duration of the cooperative approach (para. 18(g))						YEAR =>	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027 (etc...)	Est. mitigation	8-10 MtCO _{2e}	10-12 MtCO _{2e}	10-12 MtCO _{2e}	N/A	N/A
IV. D. Expected mitigation for each year of the duration of the cooperative approach (para. 18(g))																			
YEAR =>	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027 (etc...)														
Est. mitigation	8-10 MtCO _{2e}	10-12 MtCO _{2e}	10-12 MtCO _{2e}	N/A	N/A														
<p>CORE INDICATORS (IN NOTIONAL RESPONSES)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notional examples, e.g., for qualitative information • Common nomenclature if/as helpful (see CTF Annex III) • Well-known indicators of high-integrity market design could be identified in notional responses for, e.g., <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Environmental integrity</u>: CMA decisions, CORSIA EUC, etc. (G.1-3) • <u>Safeguards and Sustainable Development</u>: Same as above; also, e.g., reference to SDGs (H.1-5) • Non-exhaustive / examples, obviously 																		

3. DEPTH / DETAIL: Tools, tables, notional examples could help IRs respond to evolving best practices (2)

TOPIC	DESCRIPTION
SUB-PARAGRAPH FORMAT EXAMPLES	<p>Example sub-paragraph format(s) for complex questions, e.g., “<u>Paragraph G.2</u>: Description of how the cooperative approach ensures environmental integrity: _____</p> <p>(a) through robust, transparent governance: _____</p> <p>(b) through the quality of mitigation outcomes (general): _____</p> <p>(c) through the quality of mitigation outcomes, including through</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• conservative reference levels and baselines set in a conservative way and below ‘business as usual’ emission projections: _____• taking into account all existing policies: _____• addressing uncertainties in quantification: _____• addressing potential leakage: _____
NOTIONAL RESPONSES	<p>Sample responses/case studies could illustrate possible detail</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Reporting by hypothetical “Party A”, authorizing “Party B”, etc.• In respect of “OIMP Y”, describing “Approach Z”, etc.

A Manual for IRs should enhance each Party's and the public's understanding and TACC.

TOPIC	A helpful manual could, e.g...
1. PROCESS	Reiterate timing and process for IR/Updated IR submission, per 2/CMA.3.
2. FORMAT	Clarify procedures for submitting and updating weblinks, attachments, etc.
3. DEPTH/DETAIL	Help Parties prepare their information by offering... <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Illustrative formats• Indicators that may be relevant• Possible approaches to sub-paragraph formatting• Notional completed responses
4. CAPACITY	Be a reference for Secretariat's, Parties' A6 capacity-building programs Support market administrators, stakeholders to develop compatible resources
5. RELEVANCE	Be updated over time based on, e.g., lead reviewer reports, eventual Article 6 review by Parties, FAQs (on latter, see ETF web-based guides)