Session SB65 (2026)

Session starts: 09-08-2026

Facilitative, Multilateral Consideration of Progress

A compilation of questions to – and answers by – **Zimbabwe**
Exported on 13-10-2026 by the UNFCCC secretariat

Title: GHG projections

Question From Party: Norway

Question raised on: 09.09.2026 CEST

Question Category: Progress towards/achievement of the NDC

Question: Norway notes that Zimbabwe, owing to capacity constraints, did not develop or report projections of GHG emissions but that it plans to do so in the next reporting cycle. Can Zimbabwe share some information on the status for this planned improvement?

Answer:

Zimbabwe confirms that it will report projections of greenhouse gas emissions in its second Biennial Transparency Report (BTR2). The development of these projections is already under way and has been aligned with the preparation of Zimbabwe's third Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC 3.0).

As part of this joint process, Zimbabwe used the Low Emissions Analysis Platform (LEAP) to develop scenarios and projections across the relevant sectors. This approach kept the projections consistent with the mitigation analysis underpinning NDC 3.0 and strengthened the coherence between our NDC and our transparency reporting.

The work has been supported technically by the Stockholm Environment Institute (SEI) and the UNEP Copenhagen Climate Centre (UNEP CCC), whose assistance has helped to build national capacity in scenario modelling and projection methods. Though a capacity constraint still exists, and further capacity building is needed in this regard, the support under this process has been important in closing the gap.

Zimbabwe remains committed to continued improvement of its reporting under the Enhanced Transparency Framework and will present the full projections, together with the underlying methodologies, assumptions and scenarios, in BTR2.

Title: Provision of a description of Zimbabwe’s National Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Inventory management system.

Question From Party: European Union

Question raised on: 09.09.2026 CEST

Question Category: National inventory report

Question: The European Union notes that Zimbabwe’s BTR and National Inventory Document (NID) provides information on the institutional arrangements in place for the preparation of Zimbabwe’s National Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Inventory. The Party also reported that its GHG inventory management system is under development (Page 139 of the BTR). Can Zimbabwe provide a description of its GHG inventory management system, including details of how it will support the Zimbabwe in carrying out its inventory planning, preparation and data flow?

Answer:

The Zimbabwe GHG Information Management System (GHGIMS) whose development started during the Fourth Nation Communication (NC4) has reached a stage of development where it can be tested for implementation as a first version of the software system. The original purpose of the system was archiving of national GHG inventory data from the IPCC inventory software with focus on activity data.

The concept was later reviewed and expanded under the Capacity Building Initiative for Transparency (CBIT) project, to include calculation of emissions and to provide a framework for easy access to climate information in a transparent manner. This called for the development of an online transparency portal which now holds a substantial amount of climate information largely climatological information and compilation of official documents on climate change. In addition, there is also information on reports like National Communications and NDCs.

Because of the broadening features and capabilities of the system, the name GHG Information Management System (GHGIMS) was then adopted. One of the new requirements is the interoperability of the GHGIMS with the LEAP software whereby data generated in LEAP can now be archived in the GHGIMS and can be used for products required for reports related to NDC3.0. LEAP is the software system that has been adopted for developing and generating emissions scenarios in Zimbabwe. Currently, the sharing of information between LEAP and the GHGIMS is largely manual and there is an urgent need for automated interoperability between LEAP and the GHGIMS.

The other emerging requirement has been the interoperability of the GHGIMS with the UNFCCC ETF online reporting tools.

The development of the GHGIMS has been modular, with distinct components which could be implemented in different phases. The current stages of development and implementation of the major components are summarized in table attached.

Title: Article 6 Agreed Electronic Format

Question From Party: European Union

Question raised on: 09.09.2026 CEST

Question Category: Mitigation actions, policies and measures supporting NDC implementation

Question: In its Article 6 Regular Information, Zimbabwe reported that 12,884 ITMOs generated under the Cicada Clean Cooking cooperative approach have been subject to corresponding adjustments. Further information on the first transfers and subsequent use of these ITMOs would provide greater transparency on the implementation of Article 6.2 and help demonstrate how Zimbabwe ensures that mitigation outcomes that have been internationally transferred are not subsequently double counted or otherwise used inconsistently with their authorisation. Zimbabwe’s Regular Information states that the Zimbabwe Carbon Registry reports information in accordance with the annual information submitted in the Agreed Electronic Format (AEF). However, no Zimbabwe AEF is currently published on the UNFCCC Article 6.2 CARP platform. Could Zimbabwe provide further information on the first transfers and intended uses of the 12,884 ITMOs generated by its cooperative approach, including, where applicable, the destination or acquiring entities, and explain how it ensures that the corresponding adjustments remain consistent with the subsequent use of the ITMOs? Could Zimbabwe explain why they have not published any AEF while they have published already two Regular Reports and a structured summary with some corresponding adjustments of their emission balance? Could Zimbabwe also explain how they see the links and the sequencing between the AEF, the Regular Reports, the BTR and the corresponding adjustments in the structured summary?

Answer:

1. In its Article 6 Regular Information, Zimbabwe reported that 12,884 ITMOs generated under the Cicada Clean Cooking cooperative approach have been subject to corresponding adjustments. Further information on the first transfers and subsequent use of these ITMOs would provide greater transparency on the implementation of Article 6.2 and help demonstrate how Zimbabwe ensures that mitigation outcomes that have been internationally transferred are not subsequently double counted or

otherwise used inconsistently with their authorisation. Zimbabwe's Regular Information states that the Zimbabwe Carbon Registry reports information in accordance with the annual information submitted in the Agreed Electronic Format (AEF). However, no Zimbabwe AEF is currently published on the UNFCCC Article 6.2 CARP platform.

1.1. Response: Zimbabwe has since completed several additional rounds of Corresponding Adjustments, bringing the current total to 1,307,855 correspondingly adjusted ITMOs. All corresponding adjustments have been accounted for in Zimbabwe's most recent CTF table, and Regular Information Report. As noted here, there was a delay in the submission of Zimbabwe's Annual Information Report, but this has now been reconciled and completed. A copy has been attached for to aid further review.

Additional information relating to the publication of Corresponding Adjustments is made available through the Zimbabwe Carbon Registry. In addition to changing the status of all registry records to "Correspondingly Adjusted", Zimbabwe issues a Certificate of Corresponding Adjustment to each adjusted unit. Where an ITMO is subject to a corresponding adjustment and is transferred to an external registry prior to its final use (e.g., retirement), Zimbabwe generates a credit tracking report and digitally links each record on the ZCR with the resulting record on the third-party registry. Additional measures have been put in place to ensure that Zimbabwe is informed in a timely manner, upon the eventual retirement of all externally transferred ITMOs. This is further supported by regular audits and data reconciliation sweeps performed in conjunction with the authorised receiving registry.

2. Could Zimbabwe provide further information on the first transfers and intended uses of the 12,884 ITMOs generated by its cooperative approach, including, where applicable, the destination or acquiring entities, and explain how it ensures that the corresponding adjustments remain consistent with the subsequent use of the ITMOs?

2.1. Response: The ITMOs referenced here, and the subsequent ITMOs to which a corresponding adjustment has been applied by Zimbabwe were destined for use as offsets under the Carbon Offsetting and Reduction Mechanism for International Aviation (CORSIA) in accordance with their authorisation for Other International Mitigation Purposes (OIMP) and the conditions listed on the applicable Letters of Authorisation (LOA).

To enable wider market access, and to facilitate their use under CORSIA, the project proponent was not required to specify the final authorised recipient/end user of the units. Prior to their final use as offsets, the end user shall be authorised in accordance with the procedures established under the Carbon trading (General) Regulations (2025) for that purpose.

As a measure to promote environmental integrity and higher ambition, Zimbabwe applies a corresponding adjustment early in the lifecycle of an ITMO. This is particularly important for ITMOs authorised for OIMP, as the end user is unlikely to be known at the time of authorisation. To enable continued compliance with the applicable CMA decisions as well as the requirements of CORSIA, Zimbabwe has established an arrangement with the Gold Standard Foundation, which acts the administrator of the Gold Standard Impact Registry – the registry in which the final use is approved to occur. This, and the requirement for entity authorisation enables Zimbabwe to monitor the ITMOs and ensure that all uses and transfers occur in accordance with the applicable LOA(s).

As noted above, the block serialisation employed by most major Independent Crediting Standards (ICS) has been deemed to pose an accounting risk. This is caused by the fact that any action which splits the block creates new serial numbers, and a new hyperlink making it challenging to cross reference units with the associated UNFCCC reporting. Zimbabwe addresses this by applying an immutable CMA compliant serial number individually to all units. This enables Zimbabwe to link its credits to the resulting blocks, enabling the ZCR to function as a central, continuously updated tracking portal. This issue is not relevant to units held and retired on the Zimbabwe Carbon Registry

3. Could Zimbabwe explain why they have not published any AEF while they have published already two Regular Reports and a structured summary with some corresponding adjustments of their emission balance? Could Zimbabwe also explain how they see the links and the sequencing between the AEF, the Regular Reports, the BTR and the corresponding adjustments in the structured summary?

3.1. Response: The delay in the publication of Zimbabwe's AEF was due to internal administrative reasons which have now been addressed, and the situation rectified. Zimbabwe considers the BTR and the structured summary to be the primary vehicle through which a corresponding adjustment is made effective. As neither is

able to display disaggregate information relating to the serial numbers of the units referenced therein, Zimbabwe considers the Regular Information Report to be an essential companion. Zimbabwe reports detailed, disaggregate information relating to the serial numbers of the specific ITMOs which have received corresponding adjustments and/or have been used in the RIR. While the highest detail and most complete information can be found in the Annual Information Report, Zimbabwe therefore determined it to be essential that an updated RIR is submitted along with each update to the structured summary/BTR

Note: while a corresponding adjustment is not considered completed until the submission of the applicable UNFCCC reporting, Zimbabwe considers a corresponding adjustment to be legally irrevocable in accordance with the carbon Trading (General) Regulations (2025) upon the issuance of a Certificate of Corresponding Adjustment through the Zimbabwe Carbon Registry. This ensures that all ITMO users are able to benefit from the appropriate legal protections as early as possible.

Title: Zimbabwe Article 6 technical expert review report findings

Question From Party: European Union

Question raised on: 09.09.2026 CEST

Question Category: Mitigation actions, policies and measures supporting NDC implementation

Question: How does Zimbabwe ensure that mitigation outcomes generated under its cooperative approaches reflect real and additional emission reductions? Could Zimbabwe share its experience including challenges and lessons learnt with the establishment of conservative baseline and reference levels?

Answer:

1. How does Zimbabwe ensure that mitigation outcomes generated under its cooperative approaches reflect real and additional emission reductions? Could Zimbabwe share its experience including challenges and lessons learnt with the establishment of conservative baseline and reference levels?
1.1. Response: Zimbabwe applies a range of rigorous statutory controls to ensure that all emissions reductions and removals resulting from authorised projects represent real, additional emissions reductions. These are specified in and made enforceable through the Carbon Trading (General) Regulations (2025), which establishes a legal responsibility for all proponents of authorised activities to ensure the environmental integrity of mitigation outcomes generated in Zimbabwe. All statutory requirements imposed by Zimbabwe under the Regulations come in addition to and may not be supplemented by any safeguards applied by the applicable carbon crediting standard. Zimbabwe applies the following detailed statutory safeguards and controls:

a) Conservative Baselines and reputable methodologies: Zimbabwe requires all authorised activities to implement conservative baselines at or below Business as Usual (BAU) levels, in accordance with reputable methodologies aligned with the Paris Agreement. Zimbabwe requires proponents to submit all information relating to the baseline setting as part of the project/activity approval and registration process. This information is reviewed both against the applicable methodological standard, and against all relevant historical and scientific data by ZiCMA to assess its rigour and conservative nature. Approval, registration and authorisation is contingent on the proponent’s ability to satisfactorily demonstrate that a baseline is both conservative and evidence based. ZiCMA retains the legal authority to reject baselines deemed insufficiently conservative, or to impose additional conditions upon proponents.

To support transparency, all information relevant to the calculation of baselines for authorised activities is published directly by ZiCMA through the Project Registry on the ZCR web-platform. All baselines must be interpedently validated by an auditor accredited with both ZiCMA, and the applicable carbon crediting standard under which the resulting emissions reductions or removals are to be certified. Failure to comply with this requirement is legal grounds for the cancellation of a project/activity’s Certificate of Registration and Letter of Authorisation.

b) Minimisation of leakage: Proponents are legally required to identify, account for, and minimise potential leakage. This is evaluated as part of the project approval, registration and authorisation process. ZiCMA retains the right to reject activities where the leakage risk is deemed too high, or where inadequate measures have been put in place to mitigate or account for potential leakage.

c) Additionality: Zimbabwe applies strictly verifies the additionality of all projects prior to the authorisation. Where an activity is registered with an Independent Crediting Standard (ICS), this includes a review of all documents submitted as part of standard specific additionality tests as well as additional reviews where required. ZiCMA applies its own regulatory additionality tests and publishes all information relevant to the confirmation of an activity's additionality through the ZCR Project Registry.

d) Permanence: Zimbabwe applies a standard, enforceable permanence period of 30 years, and mandates that all project proponents conduct a comprehensive non-permanence risk assessment and develop proportional, evidence-based measures to mitigate reversal risk. This must be evidenced through the submission of a comprehensive Non-Permanence Risk Assessment and Management Plan (NPRAMP) which is reviewed by ZiCMA as a part of the project approval, registration and authorisation process. ZiCMA retains the right to reject Non-Permanence Management plans which are not deemed sufficiently rigorous and has invoked this right on numerous occasions. Open approval, proponents of authorised activities have a legal responsibility to implement any measures identified in the approved NPRAMP form, which is made publicly available through the ZCR Project Registry.

In addition to the measures identified in the NRPAMP, Zimbabwe requires 2% of all authorised mitigation outcomes to be reserved in the National Buffer Account (NBA) which is managed by ZiCMA in accordance with the Regulations. This applies to all authorised activities and is in addition to any buffer requirements applied by the applicable crediting standard.

Proponents have a legal obligation to monitor and account for reversals, and all significant reversals (>5% of the total credit issuance for the most recent year) must be reported to ZiCMA within 14 days of the reversal event being recorded. Where a reversal cannot be fully accounted for under the applicable crediting standard, ZiCMA will cancel a corresponding quantity of available units from the National Buffer Account. Where the available quantity in the NBA is insufficient, ZiCMA will either withhold a corresponding quantity from future issuances to the project (to enable the cancellation of the appropriate quantity of units) or cancel a corresponding volume of mitigation outcomes otherwise owned or obtained by the Government of Zimbabwe (including those in the National Transaction Account).

e) Direct Attribution: To prevent over issuance, all authorised mitigation outcomes generated in Zimbabwe are linked to a clearly defined, discrete geographic boundary. Two activities of the same, or an incompatible type (affecting the same carbon stocks) are not permitted in the same location, and mandatory spatial buffering is applied to ensure that no two mitigation outcomes linked to different projects ever represent the same emission reduction or removal. This is enforced through the collection and verification of accurate geospatial data by ZiCMA as part of the activity approval, registration and authorisation process.

f) Accurate, transparent accounting: All authorised mitigation outcomes generated in Zimbabwe are immutably, individually serialised and tokenised on the blockchain. Zimbabwe's two-tiered system of authorisation legally empowers ZiCMA to conduct an additional, external verification of all documents, reports and data associated with each issuance and authorisation event. Mitigation outcomes are only authorised after ZiCMA has verified that all calculations are correct, and that the measures outlined above have been fully complied with. The outcome of this assessment are published by ZiCMA and digitally linked to each tokenised unit on the Zimbabwe Carbon Registry. This allows units to be accounted for individually and digitally linked to the complete suite of relevant documentation enabling the independent verification, tracking and reconciliation of authorised mitigation outcomes.

Individual serialisation eliminates accounting risks associated with block serialisation and enables each mitigation outcome to be cross referenced with and tracked across all relevant UNFCCC reports.

1.2. Key challenges encountered by Zimbabwe:
1.2.1. Direct Attribution: During the regularisation process following the enactment of the Regulations, Zimbabwe determined that major Independent Crediting Standards had been approving projects without properly verifying the approved project boundaries. As a result, ZiCMA assisted several proponents in the revision of their boundaries, ensuring that no two projects were credited for the same emissions reductions or removals. Significant additional work was required from most proponents, as most did not possess sufficiently detailed or accurate GIS files to enable the enforcement of direct attribution.

1.2.2. Baseline setting: Zimbabwe encountered significant challenges ensuring that all baselines were set below BAU levels. This has historically not been required by most major Independent Crediting Standards, and baseline revision proved to be a complex and technically demanding task.

Title: Use of higher tier

Question From Party: Australia

Question raised on: 09.09.2026 CEST

Question Category: National inventory report

Question: Has Zimbabwe undertaken work to move from a Tier 1 approach to a higher tier in any key category sectors and, if so, which?

Answer:

The methodological approach was Tier 1 due to lack of disaggregated activity data and country specific emission factors. Resource limitations to enable the collection of disaggregated data and to work on peer reviewed and globally accepted country emission factors remains a key challenge.
