Conclusions from the 1st meeting of lead reviewers of Article 6 technical expert reviews

I. Introduction

1. The 1st meeting of lead reviewers (LRs) of Article[1] 6 technical expert reviews (TERs) was held in virtual format from 30 June to 2 July 2026. Five of the six LRs who took part in at least one of the first two Article 6 review cycles, which were centralized, participated in the meeting. A further four Article 6 technical experts, all of whom participated in at least one of the first two review cycles, were also in attendance, ensuring broader input to the meeting.[2] In line with paragraphs 41 and 43 of the guidelines for Article 6 TER guidelines contained in decision 6/CMA.4, annex II, a balance was achieved between experts from developed and developing country Parties participating in the meeting.[3]

2. The meeting helped to facilitate the work of the LRs in undertaking their mandated tasks of ensuring that Article 6 TERs are conducted in accordance with the Article 6 TER guidelines; ensuring the quality and objectivity of Article 6 TERs, their continuity and consistency for all participating Parties and the timely completion thereof; and providing technical advice to the members of Article 6 technical expert review teams (TERTs). The meeting also provided a space for discussing how to improve the quality, efficiency and consistency of Article 6 TERs.[4]

3. Key points of these conclusions will be included in the annual compilation and synthesis of the results of Article 6 TERs to be prepared by the secretariat for consideration by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement (CMA).[5] Such reports provide the CMA with an overview of the work completed under Article 6 TERs and inputs for providing further guidance to the secretariat on organizing and coordinating the reviews.

II. Organization and scope of the meeting

4. The meeting was chaired by Géraud De Lassus St-Geniès (Canada) and Ana Lucía Moya Mora (Colombia). The meeting agenda[6] was adopted at the opening session. The outcomes of discussions on the topics on the agenda are captured in these conclusions. A more detailed record of the rich exchanges among participants has been captured by the secretariat to assist it in implementing the requests to it as contained in these conclusions.

5. The LRs welcomed the secretariat's presentation on Article 6 TERs, which included a summary of experience gained from the first two review cycles and an outlook for Article 6 TERs up to the end of 2026, including planned activities to support future review cycles.

6. The LRs recognized the 1st annual meeting of Article 6 LRs as an important milestone in implementing the Article 6 TER process, and welcomed the opportunity to reflect on experience of the process to date and support the continued development of the review practice.

---

[1] Articles referred to in this document are Articles of the Paris Agreement.
[2] The four technical experts were invited to serve as LRs in the third centralized review cycle.
[3] For a list of participants in the meeting, see https://unfccc.int/event/ALRM-01.
[4] In accordance with paras. 46–48 and 50 of the Article 6 TER guidelines.
[5] As per decision 2/CMA.3, para. 13.
[6] Available at https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/share/A6-ALRM1_Agenda_Final.pdf.

III. Workload, timelines and secretariat support

7. The LRs considered the workload, timelines and key processes pertaining to undertaking Article 6 TERs and noted the significant work that needs to be undertaken before, during and after the review week.[7] They highlighted that the time available prior to the review week may not always be sufficient for Article 6 TERTs to analyse the reported information by Parties,[8] develop a common understanding of key issues identified during the review and prepare focused preliminary questions for the Parties involved. The LRs noted that substantial work may continue after the review week, particularly if a Party submits a revised initial report[9] at the end of the review week.

8. The LRs exchanged views on their role as LRs and noted that practical challenges arise from the need for them to perform both coordinating and substantive functions within the review process. They recognized that regular exchanges among the LRs before, during and after the review week are important for promoting consistency of work across Article 6 TERTs, identifying emerging issues pertaining to substantive and process matters, developing a common understanding of review approaches and facilitating the timely resolution of these complex issues.

9. The LRs emphasized the importance of the checklist developed by the secretariat as a review tool for supporting implementation of Article 6 TERs, which it does by helping Article 6 TERTs to identify inconsistencies, determine preliminary questions for Parties and develop recommendations. They noted the scope for improving the checklist, as well as other review tools and templates, with a view to reducing duplication of work, optimizing tracking of information and progress related to findings during Article 6 TERs and supporting consistency across the work of Article 6 TERTs.

10. The LRs requested the secretariat to continue supporting coordination among Article 6 LRs and technical experts, including through the facilitation of regular exchanges aimed at promoting consistency of work across Article 6 TERTs and sharing of emerging issues and review approaches. The LRs also requested the secretariat to continue work on improving the tools available to support the work of Article 6 TERTs, including on the basis of any relevant outcomes from this meeting. With regard to future Article 6 TERs, the LRs further requested the secretariat to improve workload-sharing within Article 6 TERTs; to maintain records of review approaches taken by previous Article 6 TERTs, recommendations relating to inconsistencies and lessons learned from implementing the reviews; to provide practical, example-based guidance on using the available review tools and templates, including the checklist; and to continue exploring avenues for improving information management systems for supporting Article 6 TERs and automated review tools, including delivery of the area for Article 6 TERTs of the centralized accounting and reporting platform,[10] with a view to enhancing consistency, transparency, efficiency and institutional learning across review cycles.

IV. Improving consistency, clarity and usefulness of recommendations

11. The LRs considered approaches to improving the consistency, clarity and usefulness of recommendations arising from Article 6 TERs. They agreed on the importance of applying shared approaches to formulating recommendations and developing elements of review report while recognizing the need to reflect in their recommendations the specific circumstances of individual Parties and the uniqueness of cooperative approaches. The LRs recognized that there are challenges involved in developing consistent recommendations

[7] As per para. 21(a) of the Article 6 TER guidelines.
[8] See decision 2/CMA.3, annex, paras. 18–22.
[9] See decision 4/CMA.6, para. 36.
[10] See decision 6/CMA.4, annex I, para 27(f).

across Party reports owing to the variety in national circumstances and in types of cooperative approach.

12. The LRs emphasized that recommendations should be formulated in a manner consistent with the mandate of Article 6 TERTs and clearly identify the information that Parties are expected to provide in future reporting.[11] They agreed to encourage the use of plain language in review reports in order to improve the clarity of recommendations.

13. The LRs recognized that the challenges related to reporting requirements highlighted in chapter XI below have an impact on the overall consistency of recommendations across all Parties and cooperative approaches.

14. The LRs requested the secretariat to prepare during the second half of 2026 a first version of review practice guidance (RPG) for the Article 6 TER. They emphasized that it should be user-friendly, concise, fully consistent with the guidance on cooperative approaches referred to in Article 6, paragraph 2, of the Paris Agreement[12] and the Article 6 TER guidelines, and build on the outcomes from this meeting, as well as the experience gained during past Article 6 TER cycles. The LRs emphasized the importance of ensuring that the RPG continues to evolve in the light of experience gained from future review cycles.

V. Supplementary elements of information listed in annex I to decision 4/CMA.6

15. The LRs noted that the supplementary elements of information listed in annex I to decision 4/CMA.6 may assist Article 6 TERTs in assessing whether related mandatory reporting requirements have been met and identifying any inconsistencies in this regard. The LRs agreed that such supplementary elements should not be treated as separate reporting requirements for identifying inconsistencies, but, when reported by a Party, considered together with the relevant reporting requirements.

16. The LRs suggested that, where a Party has not provided information in relation to any supplementary elements and the Article 6 TERT considers, on the basis of the Article 6 TER and exchanges with the Party, that such information could help to address an identified inconsistency, the Article 6 TERT should encourage the Party to provide information in relation to relevant supplementary elements in future reporting.

VI. Additional information provided during the review

17. The LRs agreed on the importance of maintaining a clear distinction, including in the context of resolving inconsistencies, between additional information provided by Parties during the review,[13] comments by Parties on the draft review report,[14] and information in revised initial reports.

18. The LRs noted that additional information provided during the review serves to help Article 6 TERTs to understand the information reported by Parties and formulate recommendations on the basis thereof, but does not replace or amend the information reported and, therefore, does not resolve identified inconsistencies. At the same time, they recognized the importance of reflecting progress made by Parties during the review process in meeting the reporting requirements. The LRs agreed that future recommendations should indicate whether additional information provided by a Party during a review would result in the resolution of an identified inconsistency if incorporated by the Party into future reporting, and, where it would not, specify the further information required to address the inconsistency.

[11] As per decision 19/CMA.7, para. 11.
[12] See decisions 2/CMA.3, 6/CMA.4 and 4/CMA.6.
[13] See para. 21(e) of the Article 6 TER guidelines.
[14] See para. 21(g) of the Article 6 TER guidelines.

19. The LRs noted the importance of additional information provided during the review being made publicly available with a view to ensuring transparency. Noting that the information is already summarized in the addendum to the review report, they requested the secretariat to consider practical approaches to making such information publicly available in full, where appropriate and subject to the agreement of the Party concerned.

20. The LRs noted that comments by a Party on the final version of its review report should specifically address revisions and/or additions to the elements of the report, particularly any areas for improvement, with recommendations and additional information provided during the review included in the addendum to the report with a view to ensuring the factual and accurate presentation of the Party's inputs. The LRs agreed that any comments provided by Parties will not resolve the inconsistencies identified.

VII. Teleconferences between Article 6 technical expert review teams and Parties under review

21. The LRs recognized the value of teleconferences between Article 6 TERTs and Parties under review in helping Parties to understand the preliminary findings and any inconsistencies identified, and Article 6 TERTs to seek clarification regarding the information reported and additional information provided during the review. They noted that, during the teleconferences, possible approaches to addressing inconsistencies may be discussed, with care taken to ensure that the role of the Article 6 TERTs as independent reviewers is maintained. The LRs noted that the process for identifying inconsistencies only concludes after the teleconference with the finalization of the review report.

22. The LRs identified that holding the teleconference early in the review week might benefit the review process, noting that this may require draft review reports to be prepared before the week in question to ensure that Parties receive them for consideration sufficiently in advance of the teleconference.

VIII. Revised initial reports

23. The LRs considered the role of revised initial reports in the review process, noting that they supersede the original initial report. Therefore, inconsistencies may only be resolved within the same review cycle if a revised initial report is submitted, subject to review of the information included therein.

24. The LRs recognized the practical challenges related to the timing of the submission of revised initial reports, particularly where such reports are submitted late in the review week, and considered that the sequencing of review activities may benefit from being refined in the future to facilitate the effective consideration by Article 6 TERTs of the information in revised initial reports.

IX. Key factors leading to inconsistencies and opportunities for Parties to avoid them

25. The LRs considered experience gained from the first two review cycles, noting the factors recurrently leading to inconsistencies, as well as opportunities for improving the completeness and transparency of the information reported. They noted that inconsistencies often arise when Parties provide statements or references that do not sufficiently explain how the reported information addresses the relevant reporting requirement. To address this challenge, improved guidance on reporting may be delivered through products by the secretariat, including through guidance for Parties integrated into the reporting templates.

26. The LRs acknowledged that the CMA has not provided explicit guidance for reporting on additionality in mitigation beyond the provision for internationally transferred mitigation

outcomes to be real, verified and additional, meaning that Parties are potentially underreporting on this point. The LRs noted that future guidance from the CMA in this area would improve the reporting of Parties and assist Article 6 TERTs in their work.

X. Significant inconsistencies

27. The LRs considered experience gained from the second review cycle with regard the determination of significant inconsistencies.[15] The LRs noted that the CMA has not provided criteria for determining whether inconsistencies are significant. Therefore, Article 6 TERTs rely on their own expert judgment. The LRs agreed that the criteria applied during the second review cycle should be considered a basis for future Article 6 TERs rather than an exhaustive list of criteria to be applied, and recognized that further guidance from the CMA on criteria for determining significant inconsistencies would support greater consistency and transparency in the determination of significant inconsistencies in the future.

28. The LRs requested the secretariat to include the criteria for significant inconsistencies applied during the second review cycle in the RPG.

XI. Lessons learned regarding review of information reported in relation to selected reporting requirements

29. The LRs considered lessons learned from the past two review cycles regarding the review of information reported in relation to various reporting requirements, in relation to which many inconsistencies, including significant inconsistencies, were identified, and exchanged views on key challenges in formulating actionable recommendations for addressing them.

A. Arrangements for authorizing the use of internationally transferred mitigation outcomes towards achievement of nationally determined contributions – paragraphs 18(a) and 4(c) of the annex to decision 2/CMA.3

30. The LRs agreed that Parties should clearly describe arrangements for authorizing the use of internationally transferred mitigation outcomes towards achievement of nationally determined contributions (NDCs) that are already in place rather than describe planned future such arrangements, and that this description should also cover authorization of cooperative approaches and entities. Reported information should cover specifics about the national authorities responsible for issuing and maintaining authorization, as well as applicable procedures and legal frameworks. The LRs noted the importance of Parties providing information on arrangements for making changes to authorizations.

B. Contribution of participation to the implementation of nationally determined contributions and long-term low-emission development strategies and the long-term goals of the Paris Agreement – paragraphs 18(a) and 4(f) of the annex to decision 2/CMA.3

31. The LRs noted the diversity in approaches currently used by Parties to report information in relation to how their participation in a cooperative approach contributes to the implementation of NDCs, as well as long-term low-emission development strategies, if submitted, and the long-term goals of the Paris Agreement. They also noted the absence of a sufficiently developed common understanding of information expected to be reported on this

[15] See decision 4/CMA.6, para. 41. The matter of the persistency of inconsistencies will be considered in the future, in the context of the review of reports subsequent to the initial reports of Parties.

matter. They agreed that review in relation to the reporting requirement on this matter should continue to be undertaken on a case-by-case basis and noted that the CMA could consider establishing a set of information elements that would guide Parties in their reporting on this matter and assist Article 6 TERTs in their work thereon without limiting the information Parties consider relevant to report.

C. Description of nationally determined contribution as per the information referred to in paragraph 64 of the annex to decision 18/CMA.1 – paragraph 18(b) of the annex to decision 2/CMA.3

32. The LRs agreed that Article 6 TERTs should avoid duplicating their efforts with those made in conducting reviews under Article 13 of the Paris Agreement. They also agreed that, if a Party had already submitted a biennial transparency report (BTR) when it reported information on its NDC under Article 6, this information will still be reviewed for consistency with the information reported in the latest BTR. The LRs confirmed that recommendations should be made, if applicable, for the Party to ensure consistency between the information reported under Article 6 and the information reported in the latest BTR, or for any differences to be clearly explained in the reported information.

D. Demonstration of no net increase in global emissions within and between nationally determined contribution implementation periods – paragraph 18(h)(i) of the annex to decision 2/CMA.3

33. The LRs noted that, despite the provision of complete and transparent information on how each cooperative approach ensures environmental integrity being crucial, information on the reporting requirement set out in paragraph 18(h)(i) of the annex to decision 2/CMA.3 and the relevant supplementary elements of information are broad and open-ended. They also noted that the information Parties are expected to report on this matter, including its level of detail, is not always clear to Parties or Article 6 TERTs. The LRs agreed that the review approach from the second review cycle, including consideration of how information reported under other relevant reporting requirements may be relevant to demonstrating consistency with this reporting requirement, should be reflected in the RPG. They noted that future guidance from the CMA in this area would improve the reporting of Parties and assist Article 6 TERTs in their work.

E. Robust, transparent governance and the quality of mitigation outcomes, including through conservative reference levels and baselines and minimizing the risk of non-permanence of mitigation across several nationally determined contribution periods – paragraph 18(h)(ii–iii) of the annex to decision 2/CMA.3

34. The LRs noted that Parties often report on the use of specific methodologies, standards and rules or procedures but do not always explain how the application thereof ensures that the reporting requirements and relevant provisions contained in decisions 2/CMA.3, 6/CMA.4 and 4/CMA.6 are met.

35. The LRs also noted the challenges related to developing a common understanding of the level of detail Parties are expected to report. The LRs agreed that the RPG should reflect the experience gained from Article 6 TERs already conducted while recognizing that future guidance from the CMA in this area would improve the reporting of Parties and assist Article 6 TERTs in their work.

F. Further considerations

36. The LRs agreed to apply a stepwise approach to reviewing information related to the environmental integrity of cooperative approaches with a view to formulating clear recommendations on how Parties may resolve identified inconsistencies. This would involve considering (1) whether information reported in relation to other reporting requirements could be used by the Party to demonstrate how the cooperative approach in question ensures environmental integrity, (2) whether the Party could provide information in relation to the supplementary elements of information and (3) whether the Party could be referred to relevant approaches and practices under the mechanism established by Article 6, paragraph 4, of the Paris Agreement as examples of how it may demonstrate in its future reporting that it meets the reporting requirements in question.

37. The LRs acknowledged the challenge of ensuring consistency across Article 6 TERs, given the diversity and complexity of the cooperative approaches reported by Parties. They noted that, while information reported on cooperative approaches involving a single mitigation activity type may be reviewed thoroughly, this may not be feasible for cooperative approaches comprising multiple mitigation activity types, such as crediting schemes. The LRs recognized the possibility of tailoring review approaches to the type of cooperative approach under review, including through the use of risk-based sampling and/or the review of governance policies of cooperative approaches, where appropriate. At the same time, they highlighted the challenge of ensuring equal treatment in the review of information. Some noted that, in the absence of a CMA-agreed definition of a cooperative approach, these challenges are likely to persist.

XII. Other matters

38. The LRs took note of the information provided by the secretariat on resources being developed to support implementation of Article 6 TERs, including an interim database of recommendations, updated templates for review products, online and instructor-led training materials for technical experts and updates to the Article 6, paragraph 2, reference manual.[16] They highlighted the value of further developing and regularly updating the manual and the illustrative elements of information therein in order to facilitate Parties' understanding of how to report information in their initial reports.[17]

39. The LRs took note of the information provided by the secretariat on the next steps following the meeting, including preparation of the meeting conclusions and of the annual compilation and synthesis of the results of Article 6 TERs.

40. The LRs welcomed the information provided by the secretariat on future activities relating to the Article 6 TER, including the dialogue on recurring themes and lessons learned from the reviews[18] set to take place at CMA 8, possible future exchanges with Article 13 LRs and other opportunities for promoting consistency and sharing experience across Article 6 and Article 13 review processes.

41. The LRs also welcomed the information provided by the secretariat on interactions with the Paris Agreement Implementation and Compliance Committee and noted the value of future cooperation with the Committee in relation to the consideration of significant and persistent inconsistencies.

[16] Available at https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/Article_6.2_Reference_Manual.pdf.
[17] As per decision 6/CMA.4, para. 22.
[18] As per decision 19/CMA.7, para.12.