United Nations

FCCC/SBI/2026/22

Framework Convention on Climate Change

Distr.: General
19 October 2026

English only

Subsidiary Body for Implementation
Sixty-fifth session
Antalya, 9–14 November 2026
Item 5 of the provisional agenda
Reporting and review pursuant to Article 13 of the Paris Agreement: provision of financial and technical support to developing country Parties for reporting and capacity-building

Regional workshops on experience, best practices, lessons learned and challenges related to implementing Article 13 of the Paris Agreement

Report by the secretariat

Summary

This report provides a summary of the regional workshops held between 16 February and 24 September 2026 on, or featuring a session on, experience, best practices, lessons learned and challenges related to implementing Article 13 of the Paris Agreement. Each workshop or dedicated session was organized by the secretariat in collaboration with the Consultative Group of Experts and other UNFCCC constituted bodies and relevant partners, as appropriate. The report summarizes the discussions at the workshops and sets out key takeaways on implementing Article 13.

Please recycle

Abbreviations and acronyms

AD	activity data
AFOLU	agriculture, forestry and other land use
BTR	biennial transparency report
CASTT	Climate Action and Support Transparency Training
CBIT-GSP	joint programme of the Capacity-building Initiative for Transparency and the Global Support Programme
CGE	Consultative Group of Experts
CMA	Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement
EF	emission factor
ETF	enhanced transparency framework under the Paris Agreement
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FMCP	facilitative, multilateral consideration of progress
GHG	greenhouse gas
GIR	Greenhouse Gas Inventory and Research Center of the Republic of Korea
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
LULUCF	land use, land-use change and forestry
MPGs	modalities, procedures and guidelines for the transparency framework for action and support referred to in Article 13 of the Paris Agreement
MRV	measurement, reporting and verification
NAP	national adaptation plan
NDC	nationally determined contribution
PATPA	Partnership on Transparency in the Paris Agreement
QA/QC	quality assurance/quality control
TER	technical expert review
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme

I. Introduction

A. Background and mandate

1. Article 13 of the Paris Agreement established an enhanced transparency framework for action and support, building on and enhancing the existing MRV arrangements under the Convention. The implementation of Article 13 is a cornerstone of global efforts to build mutual trust and confidence among Parties and promote effective implementation of action and support. As developing country Parties continue preparing and submitting BTRs and participating in the TER and FMCP processes, understanding their experience and challenges in, and the enabling factors for, implementing Article 13 and the ETF is crucial.

2. CMA 1 decided that Parties shall submit their BTR1 and national inventory report, if submitted as a stand-alone report, in accordance with the MPGs,[1] at the latest by 31 December 2024, and that the least developed countries and small island developing States may submit the information referred to in Article 13, paragraphs 7–10, of the Paris Agreement at their discretion.[2]

3. According to Article 13, paragraph 14, of the Paris Agreement, support shall be provided to developing country Parties for implementing Article 13 of the Paris Agreement, and according to Article 13, paragraph 15, support shall also be provided for building the transparency-related capacity of developing country Parties on a continuous basis.

4. CMA 7 requested the secretariat, in collaboration with the CGE and other UNFCCC constituted bodies and relevant partners, as appropriate, to organize regional workshops, to be held in person and virtually, on experience, best practices, lessons learned and challenges related to implementing Article 13 of the Paris Agreement and to prepare summary reports thereon.[3]

B. Scope

5. This report summarizes the regional workshops held between 16 February and 24 September 2026 on, or featuring a session on, experience, best practices, lessons learned and challenges related to implementing Article 13 of the Paris Agreement in response to the mandate referred to in paragraph 4 above. Only those elements of the workshops that relate to the mandate are covered in this report.

C. Possible action by the Subsidiary Body for Implementation

6. The Subsidiary Body for Implementation is invited to consider this summary report and provide guidance, as appropriate, to the secretariat.

II. Overview of the workshops

7. The secretariat responded to the mandate referred to in paragraph 4 above by organizing, in collaboration with the CGE and other constituted bodies and relevant partners, as appropriate, 17 regional in-person and virtual workshops held between 16 February and 24 September 2026. The workshops were either organized in direct response to the mandate or, taking into account the availability of resources, the secretariat ensured that they featured a session dedicated to the sharing and discussion by participants of experience, best practices, lessons learned and challenges related to implementing Article 13 of the Paris Agreement.

8. The workshops were targeted at national experts and practitioners from developing country Parties who are actively involved in climate reporting under the ETF and supporting

[1] Decision 18/CMA.1, annex.
[2] Decision 18/CMA.1, paras. 3–4.
[3] Decision 15/CMA.7, para. 9(g–h).

the preparation of BTRs. A total of 522 participants attended the workshops. The table below provides details on each workshop.

Regional in-person and virtual workshops held between 16 February and 24 September 2026 on experience, best practices, lessons learned and challenges related to implementing Article 13 of the Paris Agreement

Dates and location	*Region*	*In person or virtual*	*Collaborating partner(s)*	*Number of Parties represented*	*Number of participants*
16–20 February, Nadi, Fiji	Pacific	In person	CBIT-GSP, Government of Australia, Pacific Community, Regional Pacific NDC Hub	8	18
24–26 February, Bangkok, Thailand	Asia	In person	GIR, Government of Australia, Government of Singapore, PATPA	43	18
11–13 March, Colombo, Sri Lanka	Asia	In person	FAO	19	80
17–20 March, Windhoek, Namibia	Africa	In person	CBIT-GSP, PATPA	19	44
27–29 April, Maputo, Mozambique	Africa	In person	African Development Bank, CBIT-GSP, Francophonie Institute for Sustainable Development, Government of Belgium, Government of Mozambique, PATPA, UNDP	35	50
21 May	Middle East and North Africa	Virtual	CBIT-GSP	14	46
28 May	Caribbean	Virtual	Caribbean Cooperative MRV Hub, CBIT-GSP, CGE	6	8
6–8 July, Antigua, Guatemala	Latin America and the Caribbean	In person	CBIT-GSP, CGE, Government of Guatemala, UNEP	26	37
9–10 July, Antigua, Guatemala	Caribbean	In person	CBIT-GSP, UNEP	9	12
20–23 July, Wuhu, China	Asia and the Pacific and Eastern Europe	In person	CBIT-GSP, CGE, Government of China, UNDP	24	27
17–21 August, Port Vila, Vanuatu	Pacific	In person	CBIT-GSP, FAO, Government of Australia, Government of Vanuatu, Pacific Community, Regional Pacific NDC Hub	6	36
18–21 August, Nairobi, Kenya	Africa	In person	CBIT-GSP, FAO, Delft Institute for Hydrological Education, Regional Centre for Mapping of Resources for Development, UNDP	16	20
25–28 August, Jeju, Republic of Korea	Asia and the Pacific	In person	Korea Adaptation Center for Climate Change, UNEP Copenhagen Climate Centre, United Nations Institute for Training and Research International Training Centre for Local Authorities and Local Actors Jeju	15	18

Dates and location	*Region*	*In person or virtual*	*Collaborating partner(s)*	*Number of Parties represented*	*Number of participants*
31 August to 18 September, Seoul, Republic of Korea	Global	In person	FAO, GIR, IPCC	27	28
1–4 September, Bangkok, Thailand	Asia and the Pacific	In person	CBIT-GSP, Initiative for Climate Action Transparency, United Nations System Staff College	16	23
8–10 September, Baku, Azerbaijan	Global	In person	Baku Global Climate Transparency Platform, FAO, Government of Australia, UNDP, UNEP	19	25
22–24 September, Ballarat, Australia	Global	In person	FAO, Government of Australia, UNDP, UNEP	17	32

III. Summary of the workshops

A. Regional workshop for Pacific Island countries in Micronesia on implementation of the enhanced transparency framework

9. The objective of the workshop, which took place in Nadi, Fiji, from 16 to 20 February 2026,[4] was to support Pacific Island countries in the subregion of Micronesia in implementing the ETF and preparing their BTRs, as well as to facilitate peer exchange and experience-sharing among national experts in climate reporting in the subregion.

10. During the workshop, participants reported that they are making progress in fulfilling their climate transparency commitments under the UNFCCC, with many already in the process of preparing their BTR1s and updating their NDCs with ambitious targets. Some noted establishing working groups and committees at the national level dedicated to maintaining momentum for the preparation of their BTR1s.

11. The main challenges identified by participants in implementing the ETF relate to limited institutional and technical capacity, weak MRV systems and a lack of data. Participants reported that staff shortages and high staff turnover in national transparency teams, as well as reliance on external consultants, have made it difficult to retain institutional knowledge and sustain climate reporting processes. Many Pacific Island countries are in the process of developing systems for tracking progress in implementing or achieving their NDCs, but their progress in this area is hindered by significant data gaps, particularly pertaining to the energy and waste sectors in the outer islands of these countries. Participants noted that in order to use the ETF reporting tools they require time for practising, and dedicated training on, using them, highlighting the need for more sustained rather than one-off instances of capacity-building support in this area.

12. Several examples of best practices and practical approaches for implementing the ETF in the subregion were shared. Working groups and committees have been established to provide the institutional structure needed to coordinate and sustain climate reporting efforts, while financial incentives such as waste levies are encouraging improved environmental practices. Moreover, efforts to centralize and standardize data management arrangements for reporting under the ETF are being increasingly put in place, while climate funding is being used to address gaps in staffing in the national department or unit responsible for climate reporting and application of technology for ETF implementation.

[4] See https://climate-transparency-platform.org/events/workshop-enhanced-transparency-framework-under-paris-agreement-0.

13. The key lesson learned reported by participants from small island developing States in relation to ETF implementation is that sustained investment is needed in national climate reporting systems, human resources and institutional capacity. Developing data management systems, particularly across geographically dispersed outer islands, was noted as essential for robust and sustainable climate reporting. Participants emphasized that continued access to financial and technical support is crucial for translating strong commitment to climate action into sustainable transparency arrangements and the achievement of climate targets.

B. Regional workshop for Asia on the biennial transparency report preparation process ahead of the second reporting cycle

14. The workshop, which took place in Bangkok, Thailand, from 24 to 26 February 2026,[5] provided an opportunity for participants in Asia to reflect on their experience of and challenges faced when preparing their BTR1s, as well as best practices and lessons learned to consider when preparing their BTR2s.

15. Participants highlighted that the BTR1 preparation process has opened new avenues for strengthened coordination and collaboration on collecting and managing data for climate reporting among national institutions, including national statistical offices, national research organizations and universities, while fostering ownership of and accountability for data collection and management across sectors. They noted that it has also contributed to improved national GHG inventory systems, better institutional arrangements for data collection and management, greater technical capacity for climate reporting thanks to peer learning and support from development partners, and greater political commitment and accountability related to implementing the ETF.

16. The main challenges reported by participants in relation to implementing the ETF relate to the establishment of data management processes for BTR preparation and the need to address issues related to filling data gaps, dealing with large volumes of data and overcoming a lack of historical data. Other challenges relate to using the ETF reporting tools to generate common reporting tables and common tabular format tables, an incomplete understanding of how to apply the MPGs, difficulties in using higher-tier methodologies to compile the GHG inventory and difficulties in tracking progress in implementing or achieving NDCs, as well as to quantifying the impacts of mitigation actions, policies and measures and reporting on support needed and received for implementing them.

17. Participants identified several examples of effective approaches and best practices for implementing the ETF, including coordination of climate reporting at the national level, establishment of centralized databases for storing information to be reported in the BTR, development of clear data management guidelines and methodologies, and formalization of stakeholder roles with regard to collecting and managing data needed for BTR preparation. Participants viewed the TER process itself as a valuable learning opportunity and commented on how in-country reviews in particular facilitate open discussions with reviewers and help Parties gain a better understanding of how to apply the MPGs, and on how participating in the process as members of TER teams provides additional insights into the reporting requirements under the MPGs. They also highlighted the flexibility provisions set out in the MPGs as means of enabling developing countries with limited data availability to meet the reporting requirements while identifying areas for progressive improvement.

18. A key lesson learned for Parties to consider when preparing their BTR2s, as identified during the workshop, is to consider implementing the ETF as a continuous process rather than a one-off reporting exercise. Areas for improvement and capacity-building needs identified during the TER can provide a practical basis for developing improvement plans, with Parties determining how and when to address those areas and needs on the basis of their national circumstances and capacities.

[5] See https://transparency-partnership.net/event/2026-asia-regional-workshop-taking-stock-first-btrs-and-getting-ready-second-btrs.

C. Regional workshop for Asia and the Pacific and Central Asia on the enhanced transparency framework and regional cooperation on implementing climate action

19. The workshop, which took place in Colombo, Sri Lanka, from 11 to 13 March 2026,[6] provided an opportunity for developing country Parties in Asia and the Pacific and Central Asia to share their experience and lessons learned related to implementing the ETF and NDCs.

20. The main challenges reported by participants in implementing the ETF centre around data constraints and institutional limitations, with many Parties experiencing weak institutional coordination of ETF implementation, high staff turnover in national transparency teams and the absence of systems for managing and validating data and information for compiling their BTRs. Data collection is highly fragmented owing to a lack of data management systems and data-sharing agreements with data providers, and a lack of AD and EFs for higher-tier reporting, particularly within the AFOLU sector. Participants also reported struggling with using the IPCC inventory software and ETF reporting tools, tracking and reporting on adaptation and climate change impacts and vulnerabilities and identifying and quantifying the financial, technical and capacity-building support needed for implementing their climate policies and NDCs.

21. Participants highlighted a variety of effective practices and innovative solutions for overcoming these challenges. Developing clear, formal institutional structures for coordinating, and fostering strong political ownership of ETF implementation were identified as essential to sustained success in implementing the ETF and NDCs. This includes establishing a national GHG emission modelling and inventory system to improve data collection across sectors, leveraging long-term relationships between stakeholders to incentivize broad institutional participation in ETF implementation, and adopting an open, participatory approach when engaging with stakeholders where data-sharing is regarded as mutually beneficial.

22. According to participants, the primary lesson learned during the BTR1 preparation process is that robust, formal institutional arrangements are the backbone of sustainable transparency systems. Retaining institutional memory and capacity for ETF implementation requires capacity-building activities, such as peer-to-peer exchanges, involvement in regional transparency networks and specialist university courses, to be undertaken on an ongoing basis. It was ultimately noted that preparing BTRs is a continuous, iterative process that will improve with experience. Participants recognized TERs as valuable learning opportunities for identifying gaps in reporting, areas for improvement and ways to make reporting more efficient.

D. Regional workshop for anglophone Africa on improving biennial transparency reports

23. The workshop, which took place in Windhoek, Namibia, from 17 to 20 March 2026,[7] provided participants in anglophone Africa with an opportunity to share their experience of compiling the BTR1s and discuss their preparations for submitting the BTR2s.

24. Participants reported technical and institutional challenges in relation to implementing the ETF, particularly in relation to data collection and as a result of lack of financial resources. Many Parties in the region are encountering persistent issues with the availability, quality and timely provision of data from key stakeholders, as well as high staff turnover in national transparency teams and weak institutional arrangements for climate reporting, all of which are hampering the ability to meet the reporting provisions specified in the MPGs. Difficulties in obtaining financial support for BTR preparation were reported as being further exacerbated by dependence on external sources, which often take a long time to deploy, resulting in funding not being available when needed. Participants also reported struggling with a general

[6] See https://www.fao.org/in-action/climate-change-transparency/news-and-events/events/detail/asia-pacific---central-asia-regional-workshop-on-enhanced-transparency-and-regional-cooperation-for-climate-action/en.

[7] See https://transparency-partnership.net/event/2026-anglophone-african-regional-workshop-improving-reporting-btr-learning-exchange-among.

lack of familiarity with the MPGs, applying the flexibility provisions set out therein, tracking progress in implementing adaptation action and estimating the financial value of addressing climate-related loss and damage.

25. Participants stated that, to address these challenges, Parties are making use of practical planning and scheduling tools and national transparency arrangements, as well as using the IPCC inventory software and basic Excel planning tools to organize their BTR preparation workflows. Administratively, establishing memorandums of understanding for data-sharing with stakeholders, including in the private sector, was identified as vital to obtaining the necessary data, as was designating leads within public entities for each sector to receive and make sense of the data provided. Another successful practice reported is prioritizing use of local capacity and national universities over international consultants for BTR preparation to keep reporting grounded in the national context.

26. The primary lesson learned in relation to preparing the BTR1s, as reported during the workshop, is that, when factoring in the time required to procure the necessary financial support and collect the required data, the BTR process effectively becomes an annual rather than a biennial task. Participants expressed the importance of not pursuing perfection in every section of the report, which may hinder the ability to submit the BTRs on time. In addition, they perceived the TER and FMCP processes as supportive, non-punitive learning platforms that help Parties to showcase progress towards their climate goals, identify gaps in technical capacity and directly communicate investment and support needs pertaining to ETF implementation to donors and partners.

E. Regional workshop for the Middle East and North Africa on insights and best practices related to preparing biennial transparency reports

27. The workshop, which was held as a webinar on 21 May 2026,[8] provided space for participants in the Middle East and North Africa to openly discuss challenges encountered during BTR preparation and share practical approaches, tools and solutions for overcoming them. The webinar facilitated the sharing among participants of regional insights into, and practical guidance on QA/QC processes for, BTR preparation, with country-specific experience of BTR1 preparation shared during presentations by participants from Jordan, Oman and Tunisia. Participants also learned about the CBIT-GSP self-assessment tool,[9] which helps national teams to check whether their draft BTRs are complete, transparent, clear and consistent with the MPGs before formal submission.

28. During the presentations, the participant from Jordan shared how national ownership of climate reporting, strong institutional arrangements for implementing Article 13 of the Paris Agreement and systematic QA/QC of information prepared for reporting in the BTR helped strengthen its BTR1 preparation process; the participant from Oman explained how the Party is using lessons learned from preparing its BTR1 to improve planning, stakeholder coordination, national climate data management systems and internal review procedures in preparing the BTR2; and the participant from Tunisia highlighted the importance of early planning, coordinated data collection and clear deadlines for BTR preparation, also underlining that consistent information should be provided across BTR sections.

F. Regional workshop for the Caribbean on expert insights into the biennial transparency report, transparency systems and institutional readiness

29. The workshop, which was held as a webinar on 28 May 2026,[10] was guided by questions submitted ahead of time and during the discussions by participants in the Caribbean,

[8] See https://climate-transparency-platform.org/events/mena-btr-knowledge-exchange-country-insights-self-assessment-checks-best-practices.

[9] See https://climate-transparency-platform.org/knowledge/cbit-gsp-self-assessment-tool.

[10] See https://climate-transparency-platform.org/events/ask-experts-your-questions-btrs-transparency-and-institutional-readiness-caribbean-edition.

facilitating a conversation-style exchange on BTR preparation, including the related aspects of institutional readiness for ETF implementation, data management, documentation of data sources and methodologies, and ensuring continuity of national transparency systems, including the retention of institutional knowledge and technical expertise across biennial transparency reporting cycles.

30. Participants highlighted limited national capacity for preparing BTRs, reliance on short-term consultants, high turnover of staff involved in transparency reporting and fragmented institutional arrangements for implementing the ETF as key challenges affecting BTR preparation. Best practices cited for BTR preparation include gradually building national expertise in transparency reporting, keeping BTR coordination functions within government entities where feasible, using national consultants and 'training of trainers' approaches to improve local expert capacities for transparency reporting, standardizing data collection, and strengthening QA/QC measures and the archiving of data for use in reporting. Technical challenges in collating information for reporting in the BTR were also noted by participants, such as in relation to preparing inventories of national GHG emissions, developing indicators for monitoring the implementation of adaptation action and assessing climate-related loss and damage, measuring non-economic loss and damage caused by climate change impacts and tracking support needed and received for climate action and transparency reporting.

G. Regional workshops organized by the Consultative Group of Experts on strengthening capacity to implement the enhanced transparency framework

31. The CGE organized, in collaboration with partners, three regional hands-on training workshops[11] designed to strengthen the capacity of developing country Parties to implement the ETF and improve the preparation and submission of BTRs. The regional workshop for Africa was held in Maputo, Mozambique, from 27 to 29 April 2026; the regional workshop for Latin America and the Caribbean was held in Antigua, Guatemala, from 6 to 8 July 2026; and the regional workshop for Asia and the Pacific and Eastern Europe was held in Wuhu, China, from 20 to 23 July 2026.

32. Participants shared key challenges in relation to implementing the ETF and preparing BTRs, including in relation to limited knowledge of the MPGs; fragmented and incomplete data sets; underdeveloped data management, documentation and information systems; weak coordination and unclear mandates among institutions across sectors; high staff turnover at relevant institutions and resulting loss of institutional knowledge; and limited and unsustained financing. Participants also noted difficulties in developing robust methodologies for preparing GHG inventories, EFs, projections and QA/QC procedures, as well as in meeting evolving reporting requirements while addressing national capacity constraints related to preparing BTRs. Reliance on external consultants and project-based support was cited as a further challenge in sustaining institutional capacity and maintaining national transparency systems for implementing the ETF and preparing BTRs.

33. To address these challenges, participants emphasized the need to strengthen permanent institutional arrangements through clearly defined roles and responsibilities, legal mandates, dedicated technical teams and mechanisms for coordinating efforts across sectors. Improving national data management and information systems, including by standardizing data-collection procedures, documentation, archiving, data-sharing and QA/QC, was considered essential for improving the quality and consistency of biennial transparency reporting. Participants also highlighted the importance of sustained capacity-building, peer learning and the retention of technical expertise, together with the need for longer-term and predictable financing, for ETF implementation and BTR preparation. The flexibility provisions set out in the MPGs were viewed as useful for addressing specific capacity constraints when accompanied by structured improvement plans that identify (1) gaps in the

[11] See https://unfccc.int/process/bodies/constituted-bodies/consultative-group-of-experts/calendar-of-meetings/archive-of-meetings. The report by the secretariat on the workshops is contained in document FCCC/SBI/2026/19.

ability to address the issues for which flexibility provisions are applied, (2) the institutions responsible for addressing those issues and (3) priority actions and self-determined timelines for implementing them. Participants further emphasized the value of the TER process for identifying reporting gaps and technical improvements, and the FMCP process for supporting learning and continuous improvement, in relation to BTR preparation.

34. The experience shared of preparing the BTR1s demonstrates that successful implementation of the ETF requires a progressive, nationally owned approach rather than an approach that treats each BTR as a reporting exercise undertaken only when the report is due. Establishment of institutional responsibilities for updating the data held by each data provider immediately after submission of the previous BTR, systematic data-collection and BTR documentation processes, and continuous coordination of efforts among institutions was noted as having the potential to reduce data gaps in BTRs and improve consistency in data across reporting cycles. Participants noted that the application of flexibility provisions should facilitate progressive improvement in reporting rather than replace efforts to strengthen national systems and capacities in order to improve the quality of data and consistency of information reported in BTRs. Participants identified the value of organizing national training on BTR preparation featuring peer-to-peer exchange; using TER findings and previous biennial transparency reporting experience to guide subsequent improvements; and integrating institutional arrangements for implementing the ETF into existing national systems and processes for preparing BTRs. Further, sustained institutional capacity, rather than short-term project support or reliance on individual experts, was identified as fundamental to maintaining and progressively strengthening national transparency systems for implementing the ETF and preparing BTRs over time.

35. Participants indicated that transparency processes for BTR preparation can be further strengthened by developing national-level data management systems, information platforms or institutional coordination mechanisms that link GHG inventories with information on progress in NDC implementation, adaptation, loss and damage, and support needed and received, wherever appropriate, while ensuring that data remain traceable to their original sources. Overall, the three workshops underscored the importance of treating each BTR, TER and FMCP cycle as an opportunity to build institutional knowledge, test and improve national systems for implementing the ETF and progressively improve the quality, consistency and completeness of future biennial transparency reporting.

H. Regional workshop for the anglophone Caribbean on strengthening transparency of reporting under the enhanced transparency framework through shared best practices

36. The workshop, which was held in Antigua, Guatemala, from 9 to 10 July 2026 as part of the 2026 CBIT-GSP Anglophone Caribbean Network exchange,[12] gave participants in the anglophone Caribbean the opportunity to participate in peer-to-peer exchange of experience, best practices and lessons learned related to the preparation and submission of the BTR1s with a view to strengthening the transparency of reporting under the ETF.

37. Participants shared difficulties in collecting, consolidating and consistently reporting information for BTR preparation arising from fragmented institutional responsibilities and data ownership, which cause information to be distributed across a variety of institutions and maintained in different formats. They noted that reporting responsibilities are often determined on a project-by-project basis rather than being embedded in the regular mandates and workflows of the institutions responsible for reporting at the sectoral level, while competing institutional priorities make it difficult for institutions to comply with reporting requirements under the ETF in a sustained and timely manner. They noted that countries also face challenges in ensuring data and information are provided consistently across BTR sections and reporting tables owing to limited intersectoral collaboration on data collection and weak or overly broad mechanisms for coordinating that collection. In addition, limited human resources, investment and technical capacity were identified as hindering the

[12] See https://climate-transparency-platform.org/events/anglophone-caribbean-network-exchange-strengthening-transparency-through-shared-best.

establishment and long-term maintenance of national transparency systems for BTR preparation.

38. According to participants, a key solution to the challenges surrounding data collection and consistency is to establish sustainable institutional arrangements for data collection supported by a high level of political commitment to, and formal mandates that clearly define responsibilities for, providing data and support for BTR preparation; clearly defined data ownership; and information-sharing requirements across institutions. Mechanisms for coordinating data collection among relevant institutions and data providers should, they noted, facilitate regular engagement on the matter so that institutions understand the importance of providing data. They emphasized that Parties should build national biennial transparency reporting systems around existing national climate policies, planning and implementation processes, rather than establishing parallel structures specifically for transparency reporting, and develop centralized digital systems, or systems integrated into existing platforms, that enable institutions to directly enter, update and share information for BTR preparation. Robust QA/QC undertaken by data providers, cross-sectoral checks by the national climate change unit and interministerial validation of the data and information required for BTR preparation, together with clear documentation and thus traceability thereof, can also strengthen the consistency and credibility of BTRs.

39. The experience shared of preparing BTR1s demonstrates that effective reporting under the ETF is less about producing a stand-alone report and more about establishing a sustainable national transparency system for implementing the ETF and preparing BTRs embedded in related routine government processes. High-level political support and formal mandates provide important foundations for implementing the ETF at the national level, but appointing BTR preparation focal points ensures that the inputs from various stakeholders can be coordinated and assimilated in order to prepare the BTR. In order for such focal points to be effective, relationships between the institutions involved in BTR preparation need to be maintained, with clear responsibilities assigned, coordination of efforts ensured and adequate resources made available. Participants noted that centralized digital systems for data collection can reduce the number of repeated data preparation requests addressed to and the workload of data providers, while conducting systematic QA/QC and ensuring traceability of data can help address data gaps or inconsistency and improve data quality, preserve institutional knowledge and facilitate the smooth undertaking of future reporting cycles and TERs. Importantly, participants underlined that Parties should view ETF implementation as a progressive, iterative process and, rather than seeking perfection, should see each biennial transparency reporting cycle as a means of strengthening national institutional arrangements for ETF implementation, data systems and QA/QC.

I. Regional workshop for Pacific Island countries in Melanesia on implementation of the enhanced transparency framework

40. The objective of the workshop, which took place in Port Vila, Vanuatu, from 17 to 21 August 2026, was to support Pacific Island countries, specifically those in the subregion of Melanesia, in implementing the ETF and preparing their BTR2s, as well as to build momentum for climate action and facilitate peer exchange and experience-sharing in relation to implementing the ETF.

41. Participants underlined that the BTR preparation process needs to begin well in advance of the deadline for submission and requires sustained efforts to complete it, particularly because the data collection, stakeholder consultations and technical analysis of the information prepared for reporting in the BTR can be time-consuming, as can completing the common reporting tables and common tabular format tables. Participants also emphasized the importance of seeing the process as a continuous rather than one-off reporting exercise and thus establishing sustainable national transparency systems for ETF implementation.

42. The main challenges reported by participants in implementing the ETF relate to lack of institutional and technical capacity, data availability, coordination with stakeholders providing data and financial support. Shortages in skilled personnel for preparing national GHG inventories and tracking the implementation or achievement of NDCs have caused

Parties to become reliant on external consultants, resulting in knowledge gaps and poor institutional memory. Inconsistent data availability and quality and provision of data from key stakeholders poses hurdles to ETF implementation, with incomplete data sets, difficulties in accessing the sectoral information needed to prepare GHG inventories and challenges in applying methodologies for reporting on loss and damage compounding the issue. Further significant constraints identified by participants include a lack of coordination and information-sharing across ministries, private sector entities and technical agencies responsible for compiling the data and information needed for BTR preparation, as well as dependence on external financial and technical support for ETF implementation.

43. Participants mentioned several examples of best practices for strengthening national transparency systems. Parties are working to institutionalize the ETF reporting process through MRV systems, sectoral technical working groups and digital tools for data collection, GHG inventory management and tracking of progress towards climate targets. Integrating BTR preparation into other national reporting processes was seen by participants as particularly useful for reducing duplication of efforts, as well as saving time and resources.

44. Participants expressed that a key lesson learned in relation to implementing the ETF is that it should be treated as an ongoing national process rather than a periodic reporting requirement. They highlighted that critical factors to the success of ETF implementation include building on existing data management systems and data sets, making data collection part of the routine responsibilities of relevant institutions and starting BTR preparations early. Strong coordination of efforts across institutions, clear institutional ownership of the climate reporting process and technical support were also highlighted as essential. Another key lesson learned mentioned is the importance of strengthening national ownership of climate transparency by appointing technical officers in government to work alongside consultants, rather than outsourcing the reporting process entirely. Participants noted that BTRs can generate information that is useful not only for international reporting but also for national climate planning and implementation, reinforcing the value of investing in the development of sustainable transparency arrangements.

J. Climate Action and Support Transparency Training Adaptation Academy for Africa

45. The UNFCCC CASTT Adaptation Academy for Africa, held in Nairobi, Kenya, from 18 to 21 August 2026,[13] provided an opportunity for participants to reflect on their experience of reporting on climate change impacts and adaptation in accordance with the MPGs, share best practices for and the challenges encountered in preparing the BTR1s and discuss approaches to strengthening future adaptation reporting under the ETF.

46. Common challenges shared by participants in relation to reporting adaptation information in the BTR1s relate, inter alia, to a lack of clear responsibilities assigned to the different stakeholders involved in adaptation reporting, fragmented data flows across sectors and levels of government, limited availability of sufficiently disaggregated data, and NAP monitoring, evaluation and learning systems that are not yet fully developed or operational. Participants also highlighted challenges in moving away from providing descriptions of adaptation activities towards providing measurable information on progress and results, including difficulties in developing appropriate indicators and baselines for assessing adaptation progress, in testing and applying the Belém Adaptation Indicators[14] and in strengthening understanding of loss and damage associated with climate change impacts and reporting thereon.

47. Best practices mentioned by participants for strengthening adaptation reporting include establishing multisectoral technical groups and sectoral focal points to facilitate data compilation and sharing, clarifying institutional responsibilities for data collection and reporting, and drawing on information already available through NAPs, NDCs and vulnerability assessments to streamline reporting in BTRs and reduce duplication of efforts.

[13] See https://unfccc.int/castt-adaptation-academy#__26-CASTT-Adaptation-Academy-for-Africa.

[14] As per decision 12/CMA.7, para. 11. The Indicators are contained in the annex to that decision.

Other best practices cited include strengthening digital information systems to support the collection, management, sharing and updating of adaptation-related data and information and progressively developing indicators for measuring adaptation progress linked to national priorities. In testing the Belém Adaptation Indicators, participants emphasized the importance of mapping them against existing national monitoring and evaluation systems and indicators and using them, as appropriate, to strengthen existing national transparency systems rather than creating separate systems.

48. A key lesson learned mentioned by participants in relation to adaptation reporting in the BTR1s is that such reporting should be treated as a continuous process and form part of national adaptation planning, implementation, monitoring and learning activities, rather than constituting an exercise undertaken only when a BTR is due. Continuous data collection sustained institutional engagement in adaptation reporting, stronger monitoring, evaluation and learning systems for adaptation reporting and more results-oriented indicators can, participants said, support continuous improvement of reporting across BTR cycles. The discussion on the Belém Adaptation Indicators also underscored the need for a progressive and nationally driven approach to adaptation reporting that takes existing capacities and adaptation-related data systems into account while identifying data and capacity gaps for future improvement. The participants noted that the TER can help identify reporting gaps, capacity-building needs and areas for improvement for subsequent BTRs.

K. Climate Action and Support Transparency Training Adaptation Academy for Asia and the Pacific

49. The UNFCCC CASTT Adaptation Academy for Asia and the Pacific, held in Jeju, Republic of Korea, from 25 to 28 August 2026,[15] provided an opportunity for participants to reflect on experience of adaptation reporting under the ETF, assess the extent to which the information reported in the BTR1s is consistent with the MPGs and identify priorities for improving future biennial transparency reporting.

50. Common challenges shared by participants in relation to implementing the ETF and reporting on adaptation in the BTR1s relate, inter alia, to fragmented availability of sectoral and subnational data, limited availability of information on localized climate risks and vulnerabilities and difficulties in maintaining continuous data flows across institutions and biennial transparency reporting cycles. Participants repeatedly mentioned monitoring and evaluation of adaptation action as an area for improvement, including the need for clearer indicators and baselines for tracking adaptation progress and stronger evidence of progress of implementation of adaptation action, adaptation outcomes and effectiveness, and resilience to climate change. Other challenges highlighted by participants relate, inter alia, to the limited documentation in BTRs of methodologies and uncertainties related to climate impact, risk and vulnerability assessments, gaps in tracking climate finance for action to address loss and damage and adaptation, and insufficiently clear or institutionalized institutional arrangements for adaptation reporting, particularly with regard to data ownership and assignment of responsibilities pertaining to data collection, analysis and reporting.

51. Best practices mentioned by participants for adaptation reporting in the BTR include drawing on information from existing NAPs, NDCs, sectoral adaptation plans, vulnerability assessments and national adaptation-related data systems, defining focal points and data owners for data-collection activities, developing and using standardized templates and data protocols, strengthening QA/QC and archiving of adaptation-related data and collecting evidence of progress of adaptation action on a continuous basis rather than only at the time of preparing BTRs. Participants also identified the use of centralized digital MRV and adaptation information systems as useful for improving consistency and continuity of reporting, highlighting that early agreement on indicators, baselines, responsibilities and reporting schedules in relation to monitoring and reporting on progress of adaptation action

[15] See https://unfccc.int/castt-adaptation-academy#__26-CASTT-Adaptation-Academy-for-Asia-and-Pacific.

can strengthen both data quality and the institutional ownership of adaptation reporting processes.

52. Areas for improvement for future BTRs suggested by participants include moving away from providing descriptions of adaptation plans and activities towards more systematic reporting on progress in implementing adaptation action, adaptation outcomes and effectiveness; strengthening links in biennial transparency reporting with other reporting processes such as preparing adaptation communications regarding climate risks, adaptation priorities, actions, finance and support for adaptation; improving the capacity of national transparency and adaptation teams for preparing information on loss and damage; and better integration of cross-cutting issues such as the gender-responsiveness of adaptation action and the consideration of groups vulnerable to climate change impacts, and traditional and local knowledge.

L. Climate Action and Support Transparency Training programme on greenhouse gas inventories

53. The UNFCCC CASTT training programme on the preparation, reporting and review of GHG inventories for national experts from developing countries, organized in collaboration with GIR,[16] was held in Seoul, Republic of Korea, from 31 August to 18 September 2026. The programme covered reporting and review procedures under the Convention and the Paris Agreement, GHG inventory compilation, methodologies for estimating emissions in different sectors and GHG projections, featuring hands-on exercises aimed at strengthening participants' technical capacity for preparing high-quality national GHG inventories.

54. Participants noted that preparing national GHG inventories across various sectors presents significant data, methodological and institutional challenges. A primary obstacle expressed is the widespread prevalence of missing or insufficiently disaggregated AD, such as customs records lacking detailed chemical speciation for fluorinated gases, livestock statistics not broken down by age or weight class and incomplete agricultural management records on fertilizer application and crop residues. According to participants, compiling the inventory for the LULUCF sector brings challenges such as limited spatially explicit tracking of land-use transitions, infrequent land-cover mapping and sparse fire disturbance records. Consequently, many Parties remain heavily reliant on IPCC tier 1 default EFs rather than country-specific EFs for key categories, which can limit the accuracy and specificity of their GHG inventory estimate. These technical limitations are exacerbated by institutional constraints, including data-sharing workflows between public agencies being informal or ad hoc in nature, and shortages of technical personnel.

55. To address these challenges, participants reported a focus on developing institutional governance systems, encouraging digital innovation and making targeted methodological improvements. Establishing formal legal mandates and inter-agency agreements was found to facilitate continuous and structured data flows between public authorities, customs offices, statistical offices and private sector entities, with the efficiency and accuracy of data collection promoted through deployment of tailored digital platforms and templates, ranging from custom import templates to centralized digital climate transparency systems. It was mentioned that inventory teams are taking incremental steps towards applying IPCC tier 2 methods, for example by initiating country-specific GHG emissions monitoring programmes, undertaking facility-level sampling of GHG emissions and developing country-specific values for important GHG emission sources or sinks that contribute significantly to a national GHG inventory or that have considerable uncertainty or significance. Further, participants noted the value of combining remote-sensing analyses with administrative data and field inventories for constructing consistent land-use transition matrices and underscored the importance of institutionalizing QA/QC frameworks, including verification of parameters,

[16] See https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/transparency-and-reporting/support-for-developing-countries/unfccc-castt-climate-action-and-support-transparency-training/unfccc-gir-castt.

for ensuring consistency of information across common reporting tables and enhancing overall inventory quality and accuracy.

M. Regional workshop for Asia and the Pacific on implementing the enhanced transparency framework held as part of the Initiative for Climate Action Transparency blended course

56. The latest round of the Initiative for Climate Action Transparency blended course on the ETF for Asia and the Pacific was delivered as a series of online sessions held from March to May 2026 and culminated in a workshop[17] held in Bangkok, Thailand, from 1 to 4 September 2026, aimed at empowering participants to implement Article 13 of the Paris Agreement.

57. At the workshop, participants shared experience, challenges and lessons learned related to implementing the ETF and submitting the BTR1s. Participants agreed that preparing the BTR1 was a learning experience and contributed to improving their knowledge of the MPGs. The process was viewed as significantly more complex than preparing the biennial update reports owing to the provisions contained in the MPGs requiring more granular information to be reported, which led to some Parties adopting a whole-of-government approach to preparing their BTR1s. Participants emphasized the needs to improve national climate reporting systems and take a more programmatic approach to preparing BTRs if they are to meet the recurring submission deadlines. They indicated that adopting a programmatic approach requires more financial, technical and capacity-building support to be made available than is currently the case.

58. The key challenges highlighted by participants in relation to implementing Article 13 of the Paris Agreement relate, inter alia, to difficulties in securing buy-in from senior government officials to provide resources to improve national climate reporting systems; a lack of financial support for meaningful engagement by the national department or unit responsible for climate reporting with key providers of the data needed to meet the ETF reporting obligations; difficulties in coordinating the preparation of national communications and BTRs; a lack of soft skills within the relevant national teams for meaningful communication and negotiations with owners of the data needed for BTR preparation; and a lack of knowledge among national experts on consistently reporting on their use of cooperative approaches under Article 6 of the Paris Agreement across their reports under the UNFCCC and making corresponding adjustments to the relevant information in their national GHG inventories.

59. Participants agreed that critical areas for improvement, for which additional financial, technical and capacity-building support are required, relate to reporting on adaptation and loss and damage, as well as to preparing the sections of the BTR on support needed and received.

N. Workshops on advancing preparations for the timely submission of biennial transparency reports in 2026

60. Two workshops – the first in Baku, Azerbaijan, from 8 to 10 September 2026,[18] as part of the fourth Climate Week of 2026, and the second in Ballarat, Australia, from 22 to 24 September 2026[19] – took place with the aim of providing targeted technical support to developing country Parties for making headway in their BTR preparations with a view to facilitating a timely submission in 2026.

61. The main challenges identified by participants in relation to BTR preparation relate, inter alia, to poor data quality, consistency and accessibility, persistent data gaps,

[17] See https://climateactiontransparency.org/asia-pacific-officials-train-in-climate-transparency.

[18] See https://www.unfccc.int/event/the-final-mile-advancing-btr-preparation-for-submission-in-2026-workshop.

[19] See https://climate-transparency-platform.org/events/final-mile-advancing-btr-preparation-submission-2026-technical-workshop.

fragmentation of data and information across various entities, and the absence of robust national MRV systems, compounded by limited national expertise in preparing national inventories, particularly in sectors such as AFOLU, and inability to develop country-specific EFs. Participants also pointed to difficulties in collecting and managing sectoral data and in estimating the impacts of mitigation actions, policies and measures in terms of emission reductions. Further challenges mentioned relate, inter alia, to understanding and documenting the use of the flexibility provisions set out in the MPGs and reporting in the BTR on the latest NDC while tracking progress towards successive NDCs. Limited awareness of the reporting requirements under the MPGs, limited engagement of ministries and other stakeholders in data-sharing, weak institutional arrangements and coordination in relation to ETF implementation, and insufficient political and financial support for ETF implementation were noted as further constraining the preparation of high-quality BTRs. In order to improve ETF implementation, participants highlighted the need for stronger institutional coordination, improved stakeholder engagement, enhanced technical capacity for applying the MPGs, improved data systems for use in GHG inventory preparation, NDC tracking and registries under Article 6 of the Paris Agreement, and the use of TER findings to improve the quality, consistency and traceability of information in BTRs.

62. The key lessons learned and solutions discussed in relation to ETF implementation emphasize the need to institutionalize national transparency arrangements and build lasting technical capacity, rather than relying on temporary arrangements or external consultants. Participants highlighted that the establishment of national teams within ministries or of working groups spanning multiple agencies that are responsible for ETF implementation and GHG inventory preparation, supported by clear legal and institutional arrangements, has proven very effective for meeting the reporting requirements under the ETF. Developing simple, user-friendly and cloud-based tools for data management was identified as useful for ensuring continuity of reporting, preserving institutional knowledge and data, and strengthening data collection and management, while targeted and sustained capacity-building, training and awareness-raising in relation to ETF implementation for national and sectoral stakeholders were noted as key to strengthening local expertise and skills. Participants also stressed the importance of developing a road map to tracking progress in implementing and achieving the NDC, alongside efforts to integrate NDC targets into national legislation and sustainable development planning. Where data are limited, participants mentioned that expert judgment and alternative information sources can be used to help identify best practices and approaches for addressing data gaps.

IV. Key takeaways on implementing Article 13 of the Paris Agreement

A. Overarching experience and lessons learned

63. Participants in the regional workshops summarized in this report noted that the process of implementing Article 13 of the Paris Agreement has been an important learning curve, highlighting the capacity that needs to be built to implement Article 13 on a consistent basis. They mentioned that implementing Article 13 has contributed to stronger national ownership of climate reporting and highlighted it as a continuous and iterative process rather than an exercise focused primarily on preparing and submitting individual reports.

64. Participants emphasized the importance of making progressive improvements to reporting under the ETF, noting that pursuing perfection at the outset could contribute to delays. Instead, they highlighted the value of applying the flexibility provisions provided for under the MPGs, where applicable, together with using structured improvement plans to strengthen reporting over successive cycles.

65. The discussions among participants underscored the importance of developing sustainable national technical capacity and institutional memory for preparing and submitting future BTRs. Participants described the TER and FMCP processes generally as valuable for assisting Parties in strengthening reporting practices, identifying data gaps and articulating needs for capacity-building and financial support to address those gaps.

66. Participants identified peer learning; regional networks of national experts involved in implementing Article 13 of the Paris Agreement aimed at facilitating sharing of best practices for climate reporting; 'training of trainers' approaches, designed to build expertise at the local level in a cost-effective manner; and the use of universities to train people in climate reporting as effective and sustainable ways of building and sustaining national expertise in implementation of Article 13.

B. Key challenges encountered

67. Participants identified a range of institutional, technical, methodological and financial challenges affecting BTR preparation. While the nature and magnitude of these challenges vary across regions and depends on national circumstances, several common issues emerged.

68. The institutional and human resource related constraints cited by participants include fragmented institutional arrangements for reporting on climate change under the ETF. Participants highlighted high staff turnover within government departments or units responsible for that reporting and the associated loss of institutional knowledge as especially challenging, particularly where related activities such as preparing GHG inventories and tracking progress towards implementation or achievement of NDCs rely heavily on external or project-based consultants.

69. Limited data availability and challenges related to managing the data needed for climate reporting were frequently mentioned by participants. Further, participants noted challenges in progressing towards the use of higher-tier IPCC methodologies when preparing GHG inventories owing to a lack of historical AD, sufficiently detailed data sets and country- or region-specific EFs. For the LULUCF sector specifically, the challenges stem from infrequent land-cover mapping, sparse fire disturbance records and difficulties in tracking land-use transitions at the spatial level.

C. Emerging best practices and approaches for addressing challenges

70. Several participants highlighted the importance of formalizing arrangements facilitating the sharing of data needed to prepare the BTRs across institutions and sectors in legal mandates and memorandums of understanding and of securing the high-level political support needed to obtain such data. Engagement with the private sector and other data providers by the national department or unit responsible for climate reporting was identified by participants as key to strengthening data availability for ETF reporting.

71. Participants highlighted that there are benefits to integrating BTR preparation into existing national climate policy and planning processes, including for NAPs and NDCs, as well as government planning and reporting processes in non-climate sectors, rather than establishing parallel structures specifically for BTR preparation.

72. Participants reported the use of QA/QC procedures, cross-sectoral checks and interministerial validation for BTRs as critical for improving the consistency and quality of reporting under the ETF. The use of practical Excel-based tools was highlighted as a means of reviewing draft BTRs against the MPGs and identifying areas requiring further attention prior to submission.

73. Participants shared their approaches to strengthening their reporting on adaptation in the BTR, including by making use of the Belém Adaptation Indicators and other frameworks for tracking progress. The discussions emphasized the importance of assessing how the Indicators and other frameworks can be mapped against existing national frameworks for monitoring and evaluating adaptation progress, thereby avoiding the creation of parallel systems where appropriate.