
FACTORS INFLUENCING REGISTRY CHOICE UNDER ARTICLE 6.2

Decision 4/CMA.6, taken at COP29 in Baku shapes the international Article 6 registry infrastructure and what host countries must do to ensure smooth tracking, issuance, and transfer of internationally transferred mitigation outcomes (ITMOs). Registry interoperability is now a core operational requirement under Article 6, and host countries must make early, informed choices about how they will manage unit issuance, authorisation, tracking, and reporting.

In practice, host countries must ensure that their chosen ITMO-tracking arrangements, whether through a national registry, the UNFCCC international registry, or registries operated by independent crediting programmes, can communicate seamlessly with the international and mechanism registries. This is essential to avoid double counting, ensure timely reporting in the agreed electronic format, and maintain market confidence. The decision also opens new flexibility for countries that lack registry capacity by allowing UNFCCC-provided issuance services and enabling voluntary connections between national registries and the PACM mechanism registry for authorised A6.4ERs.

The checklist presents several factors that can assist Parties in making an informed decision regarding whether to rely on the international registry offered by the UNFCCC or establish and maintain their own national registry for tracking ITMOs under Article 6.2 cooperative approaches. Parties can systematically assess these factors to determine the registry type that aligns most effectively with their unique circumstances and objectives. An interesting alternative to these two options is the collaboration among several countries to build a group of national registries through regional institutions.



Checklist 1: Factors influencing the registry choice

Factors	Scope of evaluation/ consideration
Engagement in Article 6.2 cooperative approaches	Parties are invited to consider the expected level of engagement (e.g., buyer or seller of ITMOs) to determine registry needs.
Number of activities leading to ITMO transfer	Anticipate volume of ITMO-related activities, since handling multiple activities requires sophisticated registry infrastructure. Therefore, developing a national registry is advisable if Parties expect a high volume of carbon market activities ¹ .
Number of domestic projects in voluntary carbon markets	If Parties foresee the role of voluntary carbon markets (VCMs) under Article 6.2, for example, by approving VCM activities to be eligible under Article 6.2, hosting a registry may give better oversight and help track progress towards achieving their NDCs.
Past experience with carbon credit registries	Parties are encouraged to leverage any past experiences they may have with setting up and maintaining carbon credit registries, especially if they have experience under the Kyoto Protocol. This knowledge can inform their decision-making process.
Capacity building needs	Evaluate technology, personnel and institutional capacity needed to run a national registry. If gaps are large, using external solutions may be preferred.
Available funding and expected costs	It is crucial to review the availability of funding and the expected costs associated with establishing and maintaining a registry. This includes considering operational and administrative expenses. Ensuring that funding aligns with costs is vital. Parties may explore the need to develop a funding model that enables the registry to support its operations without relying heavily on external sources. Since the Secretariat may provide registry services to those unable to build their own, cost-benefit may shift in favour of not building a national registry initially.
Type of registry (Transactional vs non-transactional)	Parties need to decide whether to implement a transactional or non-transactional registry. They may also wish to consider how their chosen registry type will interoperate with other registries. This choice affects the functionality and compatibility of the registry hence increasing the technological needs and complexities of the registry.
Expected number of activities or engagement under the Article 6.4 Mechanism (PACM)	Parties may also take into account the potential number of activities or level of engagement under the PACM. This can impact their choice of registry, as different activities may have varying tracking and reporting requirements.

Source: Perspectives Climate Group

Authors: Annika Wallengren, Ingrid Wawrzynowicz, Juliana Kessler (Perspectives Climate Group)

¹ World Bank (2016): [Emissions Trading Registries: Guidance on Regulation, Development and Administration](#), World Bank, Washington DC.