

---

# UK experience with the **Draft Agreed Electronic Format (AEF)**



# Context

## Purpose of the AEF

At a minimum: to enable recording of the information stipulated in paragraph 20 in the annex of Decision 2/CMA.3 in the Article 6 database on an annual basis. We also see the AEF as playing a role in the tracking of ITMOs to ensure the avoidance of double counting.

## Links to other elements of A6.2

- Each 6.2 Party registry produces, maintains and compile records, information and data, **consistently with the annual information submitted in the AEF.**
- The Article 6 database **receives** certain information contained in registries via the AEF (e.g. the unique identifiers)
- **Depth of assurance of underlying AEF data will be influenced by various factors**, incl. timing of the Article 6.2 Technical Expert Review, the outcome of the Article 6 database automated consistency check (as per decision 2/CMA.3), underlying registries and common nomenclatures.



# General draft AEF observations

## **(1) Clarity & instructions**

Instruction/examples could be clearer in some places, including footnotes, textual examples to be overwritten, acronyms. Need for further guidance.

## **(2) Submission portal design**

Need to ensure design of the portal allows for ease of AEF completion and draws on lessons from UNFCCC National Communication reporting portal (when considering A6 and A13 portal streamlining).

## **(3) Data access & registry design**

We recognise the prerequisites such as collecting required data (incl. internal co-ordination) and registry design and development that is critical for tracking.

## **(4) Capacity building**

Capacity building will be required by some Parties to assist in meeting reporting requirements. Ensuring access to existing programmes and initiatives will be key.



# AEF element reflections

Element/column	Reflections
<b>First transferring participating Party</b>	Preference for use of ISO 3166-2 which is part of is part of the ISO 3166 standard published by the International Organization for Standardization (ISO).
<b>Sector</b>	Sectoral information aligned with Common Reporting Tables (CRTs).
<b>Metric</b>	'Metric' is currently limited to GHG or non-GHG – there is no information required on specific metrics used to calculate CO <sub>2</sub> eq. Parties would benefit from allowance for specification of metric used to calculate CO <sub>2</sub> equivalence (e.g. AR5 GWPs), to enable comparison with metrics used for NDC accounting.
<b>Conversion factor</b>	Further technical work to establish appropriate and recognised conversion methods. Analysis on best practice for GHG conversion methods and databases. Potential role of the Task Force on National Greenhouse Gas Inventories (TFI).
<b>*proposed* Technical expert review report</b>	To indicate assurance obtained from TER such as <i>“may include a link to the Technical Expert Review Report”</i>
<b>*proposed* Tracking registry</b>	To foster traceability of underlying ITMOs (and authorized A6.4ERs).



# Opportunities

## Drop-downs / discrete lists agreed based on common nomenclatures

- It would be helpful to have drop-down lists where there is a limited number of discrete options (if otherwise, support freeform text entry)
- This would help guide completion of the AEF and ensure consistency of reporting whilst reducing reporting burden
- Discrete options to be based on agreed common nomenclature (drawing on recognised standards and methodologies e.g. ISO, CRTs, IPCC)
- We see the following columns as having discrete options:  
Table 2 and Table 3 – I 'metric', L 'conversion factor', N 'First transferring participating Party', P 'Sector(s)', Q 'Activity type(s)', U 'Purposes for authorization', V 'OIMP authorized by the Party', W 'First transfer definition', Z 'Action type', AA 'Transferring participating Party', AB 'Acquiring participating Party', AC 'Purposes for cancellation', AE 'First transfer'

## User manual/guidance

- Recommend taking a stepwise approach, to include examples for each element to help guide those providing inputs
- Explanation of what is mandatory and what (if anything) is supplementary

## Opportunities for clarification

- Sequencing, in relation to the Technical Expert Review and uploading of the AEF
- Reporting of confidential information – could include drawing on A13
- Authorization in AEF – nomenclatures could provide clarity on authorization types



# Forward look

Ultimately, consistency within cooperative approaches and within NDC periods is paramount for trust in exchanges under Article 6.2

**We would strongly support a CMA decision at COP28 which has a clear adoption of the AEF**, ensuring it is designed in a manner that is user friendly, as transparent as possible, supports the avoidance of double accounting, and contributes to overall coherence within Article 6 systems (across infrastructure and reporting).

We look forward to working collaboratively with Parties towards this goal

