United Nations
Climate Change Secretariat

Nations Unies
Secrétariat sur les changements climatiques

CONCEPT NOTE

Informal interactive dialogue on the Article 6 technical expert reviews

in conjunction with SB 65, Antalya, Türkiye

13 November 2026, 10:00–13:00, Meeting Room: Room 19 - Ahlat

I. Mandate

Article 6 of the Paris Agreement recognizes that some Parties choose to pursue voluntary cooperation in the implementation of their nationally determined contributions to allow for higher ambition in their mitigation and adaptation actions and to promote sustainable development and environmental integrity.

Under the guidance on cooperative approaches referred to in Article 6, paragraph 2, of the Paris Agreement [1] (Article 6.2 guidance), participating Parties are required to submit information in accordance with the reporting requirements set out in decision 2/CMA.3, annex, chapter IV (Reporting). The information submitted by Parties is reviewed by an Article 6 technical expert review (TER) team in accordance with decision 2/CMA.3, annex, chapter V (Review), and the guidelines for the Article 6 TER adopted by decision 6/CMA.4, annex II. Following the review, the Article 6 TER team prepares a report containing findings and recommendations for improving the consistency of the reported information with the Article 6.2 guidance. The results of Article 6 TERs are compiled and synthesized annually by the secretariat for consideration by the CMA.

As per decision 19/CMA.7, paragraph 12, the CMA requests the secretariat to organize an informal interactive dialogue, to be held in a facilitative, non-punitive and non-prescriptive manner in conjunction with the sixty-fifth sessions of the subsidiary bodies (November 2026), to facilitate the identification of recurring themes and lessons learned for consideration by Parties of the compilation and synthesis of the results of the Article 6 technical expert reviews in accordance with decision 2/CMA.3, paragraph 13, including in the context of the review of the guidance on cooperative approaches, referred to in decision 2/CMA.3, paragraphs 14–15.

II. Objectives

In line with the mandate, the informal interactive dialogue on the Article 6 TERs (also referred to as the dialogue on the Article 6 TERs) is to be organized in conjunction with SB 65. The dialogue aims to provide an informal interactive platform for Parties and observer organizations involved in Article 6 to discuss, in a facilitative, non-punitive and non-prescriptive manner:

- the identification of recurring themes and lessons learned for consideration by Parties, including those presented in the compilation and synthesis of the results of the Article 6 TERs in accordance with decision 2/CMA.3, paragraph 13; and
- the relevance of these themes and lessons learned in the context of the review of the guidance on cooperative approaches referred to in decision 2/CMA.3, paragraphs 14–15.

[1] Decision 2/CMA.3 further elaborated by decisions 6/CMA.4 and 4/CMA.6.

DRAFT

III. Participation

The dialogue on the Article 6 TERs is open to participation by Parties and observer organizations. Registration for the event is not required.

To ensure broader participation, and in view of space limitations, each Party and observer organization is kindly requested to designate one representative to sit at the main round table.

Registered Party delegates and observers to COP 31 will also be able to follow the dialogue virtually through the COP 31 digital platform.

IV. Moderation

The dialogue on the Article 6 TERs will be led by moderators invited by the secretariat to facilitate discussions among participants.

Moderators: To be confirmed.

V. Format

To facilitate interactions, the dialogue will follow a **roundtable** format designed to encourage open discussion and peer-to-peer exchange.

In view of time and space constraints during SB 65, the dialogue will be organized as **a single three-hour session**. Introductory presentations will frame the discussions, drawing on key findings from the compilation and synthesis of the results of the Article 6 TERs, as well as on lead reviewers' practical experience and lessons learned from conducting Article 6 TERs. This will be followed by a moderated exchange among participants.

The draft **agenda** for the dialogue is set out below. **Guiding questions** are provided to support, but not limit, the discussion. Participants are welcome to address those guiding questions that are relevant to them and identify any further issues for consideration.

VI. Thematic focus

The dialogue will focus on recurring themes and lessons learned from the implementation of the Article 6 TERs, drawing on the results of completed Article 6 TERs, discussions at the first meeting of lead reviewers of Article 6 TERs and the annual compilation and synthesis prepared by the secretariat.

DRAFT

Agenda

Time	Topic	Format and speakers
10:00–10:30 (30 min.)	**Opening session** • Opening remarks • Scene-setting presentations o Overview of the synthesis report o Conclusions of the first annual lead reviewers' meeting	Opening remarks by the moderators and the secretariat Secretariat Co-chair of the annual lead reviewers' meeting
10:30–11:45 (75 min.)	**Recurring themes and lessons learned from the review of reported information** Participants will have an opportunity to exchange views on recurring themes and lessons learned related to the review of reporting requirements set out in decision 2/CMA.3, annex, paragraph 18, for initial and updated initial reports. *Guiding questions* 1. How can Parties ensure consistency across their different reports (e.g. Article 6, NDCs, BTRs, NIRs), as well as cross-Party consistency when reporting on the same cooperative approach? 2. What level of information should be provided for each reporting requirement, taking into consideration the information expected under that requirement? 3. How can Parties best use the supplementary elements of information to demonstrate compliance with the relevant reporting requirements? 4. Given the links between paragraph 18(h)(i) and several other reporting requirements, how can Parties avoid duplicative reporting while providing sufficient information for the Article 6 TER team to assess whether the requirement has been fulfilled? 5. Drawing on the synthesis report and the recurring themes and lessons learned identified from Article 6 TERs, which root	Ice-breaking intervention(s), followed by moderated discussion

DRAFT

	causes of inconsistencies should be addressed through revisions to the reporting guidance?	
11:45–12:55 (70 min.)	**Recurring themes and lessons learned from conducting the Article 6 TER process** Participants will exchange views on implementing the Article 6 review guidelines, including: (1) workloads and timelines for Parties and Article 6 TER teams, including the submission and review of additional information or revised initial reports; (2) implications of activity-based and programmatic cooperative approaches for reviews; (3) consistent criteria for identifying inconsistencies, including significant, persistent, and cross-Party inconsistencies and their root causes; and (4) capacity-building needs. *Guiding questions* 1. How can the review process and timelines be improved? 2. Considering the differences between types of cooperative approaches (activity-based versus programmatic), how could the review process ensure greater consistency across reviews? 3. What further guidance, if any, could support a consistent approach in the identification, classification, and resolution of different types of inconsistencies (e.g. significant, cross-Party, and, in future cycles, persistent inconsistencies)? 4. To what extent should inconsistencies be resolved within the same review cycle, given the continuous nature of the reporting and review processes? What risks would measures beyond revised initial reports and positive recommendations on additional information pose for extending the review process? 5. Which capacity-building needs should be prioritized to help Parties avoid recurring inconsistencies in future reporting?	Ice-breaking intervention(s), followed by moderated discussion
12:55–13:00 (5 min.)	**Closing session**	Closing remarks by the moderators

DRAFT