Workshop Report

Asian Transparency Workshop (Online)
December 14-15, 2020

Overview of the workshop

1. This two-day Asian Transparency Workshop was organized by the Ministry of the Environment, Japan (MOEJ), the Institute for Global Environmental Strategies (IGES), UNFCCC Regional Collaboration Centre Bangkok (UNFCCC-RCC) and the Global Support Program (GSP), and aimed to promote knowledge-sharing among countries in Asia for the effective implementation of the Paris Agreement's Enhanced Transparency Framework (ETF). More specifically, it focused on a roadmap for preparation of Biennial Transparency Reports (BTRs), and reporting under Article 6.2 (international market mechanisms (IMMs)). The overall objective of this workshop was to deepen understanding of what (elements), by when (timelines) and how to prepare the 1st BTR, including reporting under Article 6.2.

2. Around 60 participants from 12 countries and eight international and other organizations, registered to participate in the workshop, including: government officials in charge of national communications (NCs)/biennial update reports (BURs)/future BTRs and implementation and reporting of IMMs and experts supporting capacity building in developing countries.

3. The workshop consisted of the following sessions:
    (a) Opening session
    (b) Session 1: Roadmap for BTR1 – understanding basic information around BTR1
    (c) Session 2: Country experiences – sharing experience and knowledge on possible solutions to existing challenges toward submissions of BTR1
    (d) Session 3: From guidance to actual reporting – understanding current draft text on reporting under guidance on Article 6.2
    (e) Session 4: Country experiences – sharing views and experience on possible options for reporting under Article 6.2
    (f) Discussions on next steps

Session highlights

1. Roadmap for BTR1 – understanding basic information around BTR1
    (a) The existing MRV arrangements provide a perfect opportunity for Parties to do a "dry run" of the enhanced transparency framework. Essential to this are sustainable institutional arrangements, including data management.
    (b) Five steps to consider in developing BTR roadmaps are: i) understanding the reporting requirement of MPGs (18/CMA.1), ii) check whether or not each reporting requirement can be fulfilled, and identify challenges and difficulties, iii) prioritize issues that need to be addressed, and iv) consider the schedule and approaches to address each issue.

(c) If a country has already requested support from GEF, it should expedite the funded reports to be able to request funds for its BTR. If not then it can request its BTR or combined BTR/NC support as of January 2021.

2. Possible solutions to existing common challenges toward submissions of BTR1 (See Annex 3 for details):

(a) *Roles and responsibilities between the related ministries:*
Most countries discussed option 2 (assigning the main coordinating institution) and option 4 (establishing data sharing agreements) as the main short-term solutions, since these solutions can align with the existing institutional arrangements and are effective to increase the responsibility of relevant ministries. As a long-term solution, participants agreed to establish a national legal framework with official documents clarifying roles and responsibilities even though it may take time to develop.

(b) *Lack of experts and human resources:*
For the short-term solutions, countries discussed option 2 (collaboration with universities and research institutions) and option 3 (capacity building through training etc.), because these solutions can bring benefits to produce a guideline/manual for ministries and help to increase their capacity by using existing training materials, including those developed by the IPCC and UNFCCC. As for long-term solutions, most countries expressed their interest in having university programs on transparency that would minimize knowledge loss and increase the number of young experts.

(c) *Collection of the data and information on MAs:*
Countries selected option 1 (establishing consistent methodologies) and option 2 (approaching a focal point responsible for data provision) for the short-term solutions, because these solutions can identify the owner of the data and help to monitor MAs effectiveness, while also increasing the transparency and accuracy of the data. Countries also highlighted the importance of private sector engagement in the data collection process. For the long-term solution, most countries voted for option 2, that is, to develop legislation allowing countries to have detailed regulation and legal documents for data collection.

3. Understanding current draft text on reporting under guidance on Article 6.2

(a) Keeping in mind there are some remaining issues to be negotiated further at COP26 scheduled in 2021, advanced preparatory work can be beneficial for countries, including corresponding adjustments, reporting, and tracking and review.

(b) Key characteristics of the anticipated reporting under Article 6.2 based on the current draft text included: timing of submission of Initial Reports (IRs), types of Internationally Transferred Mitigation Outcomes (ITMOs) used for corresponding adjustments, and arrangements for authorization of ITMOs.

(c) Possible reporting options can be evaluated on the basis of transparency and administrative efficiency. It is important for the Joint Crediting Mechanism (JCM)

partner countries to ensure understanding of reporting requirements, their implications, and where relevant, areas of improvement to the rules and guidelines of the JCM.

4. Possible options for reporting under Article 6.2 (See Annex 4 for details):
    (a) The participants deepened understanding on basic terminologies used in the draft guidance of Article 6 (e.g. ITMOs, corresponding adjustments, first transfer, arrangements for authorization, initial report, annual information, and regular information) through group discussions.
    (b) For the timing of submission of the initial report, many participants preferred to submit it in conjunction with the BTR1 in 2024 as this would be more efficient and allows more time for preparation including coordination among partner countries. Submission before in 2022 or 2023 will result in simplified contents.
    (c) For corresponding adjustments, some participants agreed that a vintage year can be tracked using registries of each scheme including the JCM and preferred corresponding adjustments based on the vintage year to first transfer year to enhance transparency. However, this is a technical topic which requires further understanding among participants. One participant commented that more work is required to understand the different implications for achieving the NDC.
    (d) With regard to authorization arrangements, participants discussed the implications of different options in terms of governance and level of authorization. Many participants agreed that the annual meeting of the Joint Committee (JC) which is composed of relevant ministries from host countries and Japan could be efficiently used for authorization arrangements and that project level authorization is in line with existing project approval and registration process.

5. Next steps and regional collaboration:
    (a) Many participants expressed that capacity building and mutual learning (ML) among countries are important areas to explore in 2021, with a view to preparing for BTR submissions in 2024.
    (b) In particular, capacity building is necessary for institutional arrangements and infrastructure, including for Article 6 reporting and tracking of ITMOs; strategies or roadmaps for BTRs, including identifying gaps in legal and institutional coordination and methodologies; and data collection and improvement of methodologies for on-going NCs and BURs.
    (c) Along with other support initiatives, the ML programme can be useful, as it allows countries to conduct actual drafting exercises of reporting, and allows countries to understand what different reporting options might mean in each country. Importantly, support initiatives should be in line with the plan that countries have for preparing BTRs.

Major discussion points and Q&A

Session 1:

1. One participant asked whether or not the final BUR can be considered as the first BTR. A speaker from the UNFCCC secretariat replied that while there are commonalities between BURs and BTRs, the two reports are different in terms of what needs to be included. It will also depend on where each country stands for the preparation of on-going reports. Another participant requested updates on the status of international negotiation on transparency. A presenter from the UNFCCC secretariat responded that useful information exchange and inputs were provide during the November Dialogue in order to inform Parties, so that when negotiations resume, they can bridge the gaps and reach agreements as much as possible.

2. Another participant inquired as to whether non-GHG data are used for an indicator to track the progress of NDC implementation, and if so, what should be the latest reporting year in BTRs. A speaker from MURC replied that this is not clearly stipulated in the MPGs, although his personal view is that the latest reporting year for non-GHG indicators should be consistent with GHG indicators, which is two years prior to the submission year.

3. Some participants wanted to know more about the Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) process of Japan's reporting. The same speaker responded with an example of Japan's national GHG inventories. For QC, first, the Greenhouse Gas Inventory Office of Japan (GIO) performed a self-check. This is then followed by QC conducted by data providers as well as by private consulting firms. For QA, Japan established a QA working group, focusing on particular sectors, which then produces a QA report.

4. A question was asked about the modalities of accessing financial support and if they are likely to be revised in the near future. The presenter from UNEP-DTU mentioned that the current modalities could be revised in order to streamline the support available for countries so that they can prepare BTRs every two years.

Session 2:

5. One participant asked what would be an appropriate timeframe for countries to establish a national legal framework for clarifying roles and responsibilities since the participants mentioned that it may take time. The facilitator of Group 1 commented that it depends on the country because in some countries it only takes 2-3 years to establish a national legal framework, but in others, it may take more time.

6. A question was raised on flexibility issues for the digital system on data collection. The facilitator of Group 3 explained that the digital system may lack flexibility in maintaining and updating the system because IT system development requires time, experts, additional technologies, and funding.

7. One participant asked what the biggest challenge is when trying to secure human resources. The facilitator of Group 2 responded by explaining their country's experience, whereby non-stable management for transparency-related work may lead to a loss of some main experts in the field.

8. A question was raised about long term planning and asked if projection play a role to indicate that mitigation actions are moving toward a country's NDC target. The facilitator of Group 1 highlighted that long-term strategy should be correlated and

integrated with sectoral planning, e.g. increasing wind power share in the energy sector should be embedded in long-term strategy for next 15-20 years.

Session 3:

9. One participant requested clarification for whether or not CORSIA has to apply corresponding adjustments. A speaker from IGES mentioned that corresponding adjustments is requested also for ITMOs used for other mitigation purposes, such as CORSIA.

10. There was a question on how the presenter came up with the two criteria of transparency and administrative effectiveness. The presenter from TGO highlighted that there were also other criteria considered during discussions that took place under the mutual learning program (e.g. international appeal); however, he selected the ones that are overarching and relevant to all issues under discussion today. Another participant agreed with the two criteria presented by the speaker, and added that the criteria on environmental effectiveness could be applied to the implementation of the mechanism itself.

11. One participant shared his view that what is most important is how one country agrees with its partner country on how reporting should be carried out at the early stage of implementation of Article 6 mechanisms. He stressed that reporting should not be treated simply as an obligation under international requirements. Rather, it should be based on the necessity of those countries participating in Article 6 mechanisms.

12. Another participant pointed out that development of infrastructure around Article 6 reporting seems to be key. He considers that the JCM has established such an infrastructure already; however it is also vital to look at other Article 6 mechanisms which are implemented for a relatively short period of time or that are new. He also highlighted that the choice of a vintage year or a year of first transfer for corresponding adjustments was discussed intensively during international negotiations. He thinks that treatment of ITMOs generated during the NDC implementation should be clarified. Similarly, there needs to be clearer treatment of ITMOs used for voluntary purposes ahead of COP26.

Session 4:

13. There was an inquiry about what was discussed in group discussions in relation to further international negotiations on arrangements for authorization while arrangements for authorization might be more country-driven and decided among relevant countries. One participant responded that arrangements for authorization might be a national process and further international negotiations are required in other topics (e.g. timing of reporting, information to be reported, corresponding adjustments), but the national decisions on arrangements for authorization might depend on the decisions made on other topics and adoption of Article 6. An additional comment was given on the amount of ITMOs to be authorized stating that it is another important factor as it will require corresponding adjustments.

14. One participant asked what was discussed in group discussions in relation to further clarity required for timing of submission of the initial report. In reply, it was stated that

three points were discussed; 1. whether the initial report should be submitted more than once (e.g. "before authorization of initial first transfer of mitigation outcomes"), 2. whether IRs should be submitted and/or "in conjunction with the next due BTR"; and 3. whether it should be submitted as a stand-alone report or as part of BTR including as Annex.

15. Another participant mentioned there are different implications for each reporting option, and the balance between international process and domestic process is important. At the same time, transparency and practicality need to be ensured.

<u>Next steps and regional collaboration:</u>

16. Many participants expressed the view that capacity building and mutual learning (ML) among countries are some of the most important areas to explore as part of the next action in 2021. Some participants also noted that even though BTR submissions are expected in 2024, preparation needs to start as soon as possible from now.

17. As for areas of capacity building, countries expressed the need for additional capacity building for: institutional arrangements and infrastructure, including for Article 6 reporting and tracking of ITMOs; strategies or roadmaps for BTRs, including identifying gaps in legal, institutional coordination and methodologies; data collection and improvement of methodologies for on-going NCs and BURs.

18. One country which participated in the ML programme highlighted that the programme is useful because it allows countries to conduct actual drafting exercises of reporting. It also allows countries to understand what different reporting options might mean in each country, which can then potentially be inputted into on-going international discussions.

19. While different initiatives are available to support countries, it is important such support is in line with the plan that countries have for preparing BTRs. Of them, the GEF's financial support for BTRs will be open from January 2021 for eligible countries.

Annex 1: Agenda

December 14, 2020 - Day 1 (Time in JST)		
MC: Chisa Umemiya, IGES		
Opening		
15:00-15:05	Opening remarks	Noriko Hase, Deputy Director, Office of Market Mechanisms, Global Environmental Bureau, MOEJ
15:05-15:10		Miriam Hinostroza, UNEP Liaison Officer, UNEP
15:10-15:15	Introduction to the workshop	Chisa Umemiya, IGES
Session 1: Roadmap for BTR1 – understanding basic information around BTR1		
Key questions: What are the elements and timelines needed to be considered for countries to prepare BTR1? What should be done in the short and long terms?		
15:15-15:30	Paris Agreement and the MPGs for ETF	Jihye Choi, UNFCCC
15:30-15:45	Domestic preparation toward 1st BTR submission	Takashi Morimoto, MURC
15:45-16:00	Accessing to international funding and support	Fatima-Zahra, UNEP-DTU
16:00-16:30	Q&As	All
16:30-16:50	Break	
Session 2: Country experiences – sharing experience and knowledge on possible solutions to existing challenges toward submissions of BTR1		
16:50-17:00	Introduction to the Session 2	Temuulen Murun, IGES
17:00-18:00	Breakout group discussions (3 groups): *Related to a general framework for tracking progress of individual mitigation actions (MAs) in BTRs, possible solutions for existing common challenges have been identified through the pre-survey. The question addressed in each group is: Which possible solution would you prefer, and why?* Group 1: · Roles and responsibilities Group 2: · Experts and human resources Group 3: · Data collection	Facilitators: Group 1: Buddika Hemashantha/ Chisa Umemiya Group 2: Undarmaa Khurelbaatar/ Tomohiko Hattori Group 3: Irawan Asaad/ Temuulen Murun
18:00-18:15	Break	
18:15-19:15	Discussions and summary: "Roadmap for BTR1" · Reporting back from each group · Further feedback and discussions	Facilitated by Takashi Morimoto Each group facilitator All

December 15, 2020 - Day 2 (Time in JST)		
MC: Temuulen Murun, IGES		
Opening		

15:00-15:10	Summary from Day 1	Jens Radschinski, UNFCCC-RCC
Session 3: From guidance to actual reporting – understanding current draft text on reporting under guidance on Article 6.2		
Key questions: How does actual reporting look like, using the JCM as an example, and what are the elements and timelines needed to be considered for countries to prepare reporting under Article 6.2?		
15:10-15:20	Updates on international negotiations on Article 6	Kentaro Takahashi, IGES
15:20-15:35	Reporting under Article 6.2 in current draft text	Tomohiko Hattori, IGES
15:35-15:50	Results of writing exercise with the JCM	Supanut Chotevitayatarakorn, Thailand
15:50-16:20	Q&As and discussions · Feedback from countries · Further feedback	Simon Fellermeyer, Switzerland Muslim Anshari Rahman, Singapore All
16:20-16:40	Break	
Session 4: Country experiences – sharing views and experience on possible options for reporting under Article 6.2		
16:40-16:45	Introduction	Tomohiko Hattori, IGES
16:45-17:50	Breakout group discussions (3 groups): Group 1: · Reporting timeframe: *When do you think your country could submit an Initial Report?* Group 2: · Methodological issues: *Whether "vintage year" or "first transfer year" should be used for corresponding adjustments?* Group 3: · Authorization: *How do you think your country could make arrangements for authorization?*	Facilitators/Reporters: Group 1: Chisa Umemiya/ Takashi Morimoto Group 2: Tomohiko Hattori/ Temuulen Murun Group 3: Supanut Chotevitayatarakorn/ Paweena Panichayapichet
17:50-18:05	Break	
18:05-18:50	Discussions and summary: Roadmap for Reporting under Article 6.2 · Reporting back from each group · Further feedback and discussions	Facilitated by Kentaro Takahashi Each group reporter All
18:50-19:10	Discussions on next steps – *How could regional collaboration and network contribute for countries to submit BTR1?* · Inputs and feedback from all	Facilitated by Fatima-Zahra, UNEP-DTU All
19:10-19:15	Closing remarks	Yasuo Takahashi, Executive Director of IGES

Annex 2: List of Participants (registered)

Countries:

No (Country)	Country/Organization	No (organization)	No (Person)	Name	Organization	Title
1	Cambodia	1	1	H.E. Sum Thy	Ministry of Environment	Deputy Secretary General
			2	Dr. Hak Mao	Ministry of Environment	Director
			3	Mr. Leang Sophal	Ministry of Environment	Head of GHG Inventory and Mitigation Office
2	Indonesia	2	4	Mr. Irawan Asaad	Ministry of Environment and Forestry	Deputy Director
			5	Ratnasari Wargahadibrata	Ministry of Environment and Forestry	Deputy Director
		3	6	Mr. Cahyadi Yudodahono	Coordinating Ministry for Economic Affairs	Deputy Director
			7	Mr. Dicky Edwin Hindarto	Coordinating Ministry for Economic Affairs	Consultant
3	Japan	4	8	Mr. Kazuhisa Koakutsu	Ministry of Environment, Japan (MOEJ)	Director of International Negotiations
			9	Ms. Noriko Hase	Ministry of Environment, Japan (MOEJ)	Deputy Director
			10	Mr. Hironori Aoki	Ministry of Environment, Japan (MOEJ)	Researcher
4	LaoPDR	5	11	Mr. Khatthaneth Sensathith	Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment	Officer
			12	Mr. Bouathong Theothavong	Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment	Technical Official
			13	Mr. Xailee Xayaxang	Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment	Technical Official
5	Malaysia	6	14	Ahmad Farid Mohammed	Ministry of Environment & Water (KASA)	Deputy Undersecretary (Climate Change)
			15	Ms. Dayang Ratnasari Abu Bakar	Ministry of Environment & Water (KASA)	Head of GHG Inventory Unit
			16	Mr. Muhammad Ridzwan Ali	Ministry of Environment & Water (KASA)	Senior Assistant Secretary
		7	17	Dr. Elizabeth Philip	Ministry of Energy and Natural Resources (KETSA)	Head of REDD Plus

6	Mongolia	8	18	Ms. Otgontsetseg Luvsandash	Ministry of Environment and Tourism of Mongolia (MET)	JCM Secretariat
			19	Ms. Undarmaa Khurelbaatar	Ministry of Environment and Tourism of Mongolia (MET)	NC4/BUR2 Project Coordinator
			20	Ms. Bumtsend Tegsjargal	Ministry of Environment and Tourism of Mongolia (MET)	GHG Inventory Specialist
			21	Ms. Davaasambuu Ulzii-orshikh	Ministry of Environment and Tourism of Mongolia (MET)	GHG Inventory Specialist
			22	Ms. Narangarwuu Altangerel	Ministry of Environment and Tourism of Mongolia (MET)	Officer in charge of climate change projects
7	Myanmar	9	23	Dr. San Win (Mr.)	Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Conservation	Deputy Director
			24	Ms.Thi Thi Soe Min	Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Conservation	Assistant Director
8	Philippines	10	25	Ms. Sandee Recabar	Environmental Management Bureau	Chief
			26	Mr. Albert Magalang	Environmental Management Bureau	Chief
			27	Mr. Rolando Abad, Jr.	Environmental Management Bureau	Science Research Specialist II
9	Republic of Korea	11	28	Mr. Dong-hyuk Shin	Greenhouse Gas Inventory and Research Center of Korea (GIR), Ministry of Environment	Researcher (Int'l Cooperation Unit)
10	Singapore	12	29	Ms. Eleanor Soh	National Environment Agency	Assistant Director (Carbon Pricing Collection)
			30	Ms. Winnie Chia	National Environment Agency	Executive Engineer (Greenhouse Gas Inventory Branch)
		13	31	Mr. Muslim Anshari Rahman	National Climate Change Secretariat	Assistant Director (International Policy)
			32	Ms. Alyssa Ng	National Climate Change Secretariat	Senior Manager (International Policy)
11	Switzerland	14	33	Mr. Simon Fellermeyer	Federal Office for the Environment FOEN	Policy Adviser
12	Thailand	15	34	Dr. Natthanich Asvapoositkul	Office of Natural Resources and Environmental Policy and Planning (ONEP)	Director
			35	Mr. Sivach Kaewcharoen	Office of Natural Resources and Environmental Policy and Planning (ONEP)	Director
			36	Ms. Karnpanich Tunskul	Office of Natural Resources and Environmental Policy and Planning (ONEP)	Environmentalist
		16	37	Dr. Pongvipa Lohsomboon	Thailand Greenhouse Gas Management Organization (TGO)	Deputy Executive Director
			38	Ms. Anothai Sangthong	Thailand Greenhouse Gas Management Organization (TGO)	Director
			39	Ms. Sumon Sumetchoengprachya	Thailand Greenhouse Gas Management Organization (TGO)	Director
			40	Ms. Paweena Panichayapichet	Thailand Greenhouse Gas Management Organization (TGO)	Manager
			41	Mr. Nopparat Phromin	Thailand Greenhouse Gas Management Organization (TGO)	Manager
			42	Mr. Supanut Chotevitayatarakorn	Thailand Greenhouse Gas Management Organization (TGO)	Legal Officer (Specialist)

International organizations:

1	OECD	1	43	Ms. Elisa Thomas	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)	
2	IPCC	2	44	Mr. Kiyoto Tanabe	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change - Task Force on National Greenhouse Gas Inventories (TFI)	Co-Chair
			45	Dr. Sandro Federici	Technical Support Unit (TSU) for the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change - Task Force on National Greenhouse Gas Inventories (TFI)	Head
			46	Ms. Baasansuren Jamsranjav	Technical Support Unit (TSU) for the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change - Task Force on National Greenhouse Gas Inventories (TFI)	Senior Programme Officer
3	UNFCCC	3	47	Ms. Jihye Choi	UNFCCC	

Organizers/Secretariat:

1	UNEP	1	48	Ms. Miriam Hinostroza	United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)	
			49	Ms. Fatima-Zahra Taibi	United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) -DTU	
			50	Ms. Julie Rasmussen	United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) -DTU	Programme Associate
2	UNEP(GSP)	2	51	Mr. Buddika Hemashantha	Global Support Programme	
3	UNFCCC-RCC	3	52	Mr. Jens Radschinski	UNFCCC Regional Collaboration Centre	Head
4	MURC	4	53	Mr. Takashi Morimoto	Mitsubishi UFJ Research and Consulting Co., Ltd (MURC)	Chief Analyst
	MURC		54	Ms. Yui Ogawa	Mitsubishi UFJ Research and Consulting Co., Ltd (MURC)	Analyst
5	IGES	5	55	Ms. Yuqing Ariel Yu	Institute for Global Environmental Strategies (IGES)	Deputy Director
	IGES		56	Mr. Yasuo Takahashi	Institute for Global Environmental Strategies (IGES)	Executive Director
	IGES		57	Mr. Kentaro Takahashi	Institute for Global Environmental Strategies (IGES)	Programme Manager
	IGES		58	Dr. Chisa Umemiya	Institute for Global Environmental Strategies (IGES)	Research Manager
	IGES		59	Mr. Tomohiko Hattori	Institute for Global Environmental Strategies (IGES)	Researcher
	IGES		60	Ms. Temuulen MURUN	Institute for Global Environmental Strategies (IGES)	Researcher
	IGES		61	Ms. Ayumi Nagatomo	Institute for Global Environmental Strategies (IGES)	Assistant Programme Coordinator
	IGES		62	Ms. Reiko Ito	Institute for Global Environmental Strategies (IGES)	Programme Coordinator

IGES
Institute for Global
Environmental Strategies

環境省
Ministry of the Environment

GLOBAL SUPPORT
PROGRAMME

Annex 3: Session 2. Breakout group discussion summary

Table 1. Group 1 discussion. Roles and responsibilities

Options for possible solutions in the short term (~5 years)	Option 1. Establishing a project steering committee or working groups involving key ministries	Option 2. Assigning the main coordinating institution to direct roles and responsibilities for key ministries	Option 3. Providing clear guidance on roles and responsibilities supported by high-level people (e.g., Ministers)	Option 4. Establishing data sharing agreements and MOUs at the organizational level with key ministries and non-governmental stakeholders
Discussion on reasons to choose	It can involve many relevant stakeholders	Aligning with existing institutional arrangements and collaboration with national focal point to the UNFCCC		It can increase responsibility of stakeholders, especially for providing data collection in key ministries
Discussion on reasons not to choose	It may take time		-May depend on personal relationship -The high-level people may change	It may take time
Options for possible solutions in the long term (~10 years)	Option 1. Establishing a national legal framework for government and non-government stakeholders (legislation and official documentation of the institutional arrangements)		Option 2. Embedding climate change issues (GHG emission reduction) into ministries' agenda and strategic plan	
Reason to choose	-Official documents are important to set standards -It can provide stronger basis for the longer term			

Reasons not to choose	It may take time		When political situations change ministries' main strategy and policy may change	

Table 2. Group 2. Lack of experts and human resources

Options for possible solutions in the short term (~5 years)	Option 1. Hiring national experts and consultants from the relevant ministries	Option 2. Collaboration with domestic universities and research institutes (including establishing a network of scientists)	Option 3. Capacity building in a sustainable manner through training, workshops and seminars (domestically and internationally)	Option 4. Providing incentives to attract technical experts by developing a clear career progression pathway
Discussion on reasons to choose		-It can provide sector-specific knowledge -It can support to produce standard operating procedure and manuals based on institutional knowledge	-It helps stakeholders from other ministries to build their capacities -There are many learning materials for capacity building such as IPCC guideline and UNFCCC handbooks	If incentives for work achievement could be provided, it helps to attract more experts
Discussion on reasons not to choose	There is a lack of knowledge in key ministries, and ministry staff are overloaded with multiple tasks			
Options for possible solutions in the long term (~10 years)	Option 1. Securing the state budget for key experts in the relevant ministries	Option 2. Establishing university programs (grad school) related to climate change and transparency to increase the number	Option 3. Aligning climate change policy to establish a task force for dedicating transparency related work in the relevant ministries	

13

		of young professionals	
Discussion on reasons to choose		-It helps minimize knowledge loss in the long term due to staff turnover -It can increase limited human resources and expertise	It can help to set up a budget for implementation of MAs.
Discussion on reasons not choose			If an entity/task force is newly established it may face difficulties in securing a budget

Table 3. Group 3 discussion. Collection of data and information on MAs

Options for possible solutions in the short term (~5 years)	Option 1. Establishing consistent methodologies for monitoring the progress of MAs	Option 2. Appointing a focal point responsible for data provision in the relevant ministries	Option 3. Common reporting templates in a tabular format on an agreed regular time frame (e.g. excel sheet)	Option 4. Developing a clear and sound Standard Operational Procedure
Discussion on reasons to choose	-It helps to monitor MAs effectiveness and it needs to be consistent with IPCC guidelines -It increases transparency and accuracy of data	It helps to identify the owner of the provided data but it requires a higher level of authority to enhance -It may help to engage with the private sector (non-party stakeholders)	It improves transparency and accuracy of data	It can ease the process of data collection and information between relevant ministries

IGES
Institute for Global
Environmental Strategies

環境省
Ministry of the Environment

GLOBAL SUPPORT
PROGRAMME

Online polling	38%	38%	13%	13%
Options for possible solutions in the long term (~10 years)	Option 1. Reorganizing regulations related to climate change in individual legal systems	Option 2. Developing legislation and detailed regulations including MRV guidelines for MAs	Option 3. Creating a digital system to archive and track GHG emission reductions of MAs	Option 4. Continuous improvement of the information collection system (including evaluation and feedback mechanism)
Discussion on reasons to choose	-It is useful because countries have already developed some regulations on climate change -Existing regulations have some limitations so reorganizing helps to improve and update	-It allows countries to have detailed regulations to engage other ministries and private sector -Legal documentations of data collection is important	-It requires less time/burden to collect and share data and information - It increases transparency and consistency, and it ease to archive data from different sectors	-It can identify gaps and needs which will be used to secure international supports -It helps further improvements and establish sustainable collection reporting

Discussion on reasons not to choose			-The digital system may lack flexibility in maintaining and updating the system because IT system development requires time, experts, and funding	
Online polling	25%	50%		25%

Annex 4: Session 4. Breakout group discussion summary

Group 1: **Reporting timeframe:** *When do you think your country could submit an Initial Report?*

	Option 1: Before initial authorization or first transfer (e.g. in 2022-2023)	**Option 2**: In conjunction with first BTR (e.g. in 2024)
Reasons/ implications	Avoid overburden on the preparation of IR and BTR at the same time	Much simpler
	The earlier, the better.	BTR should include overall MAs to achieve NDC including ITMOs
	The content of initial report should be simple because there will be less time for preparation	More practical because Article 6 guidance is still under negotiation
		More transparent and administratively efficient
		More time to set up infrastructure for ITMOs
		More time to coordinate with partner countries
Poll		**Majority**

Group 2: **Methodological issues:** *Whether "vintage year" or "first transfer year" should be used for corresponding adjustments?*

	Option1: Vintage year	**Option 2**: First transfer year
Reasons/ implications	More transparent	Further clarification on how to deal with mitigation outcomes first-transferred after NDC implementation period is necessary
	Should not be difficult to track vintage year for most schemes even using excel data	

	Should wait for the decision on methodology for corresponding adjustment to discuss the topic
	Depends on what types of NDC countries have (e.g. single year target or multiple year target)
	JCM credits from the projects can be tracked because the partner countries have the registry system to track
Poll	Majority	

Group 3: **Authorization:** *How do you think your country could make arrangements for authorization?*

Authorization governance	**Option1**: Joint Committee (JC)	**Option 2**: Each government (unilateral)
Reasons/ implications	Annual meeting as per the Rules of Implementation	It takes time for coordination among National Focal Point and competent authorities
	JC members are selected from relevant ministries by each government	May depend on the BTR preparation cycle, which might be different from Article 6 timeframe
	JC institutional arrangements are already in place	Needs careful consideration on allocation of credits between both sides, as well as on first transfer and corresponding adjustments

Level of authorization	**Option1**: Scheme level	**Option2**: Project level	**Option3**: Transfer/issuance level	**Additional comments**
Reasons/ implications	Simple to implement	Aligns with project approval and registration process	May be too stringent oversight	Needs to be decided by competent authorities/ government
	Needs to coordinate	Links with the process/oper		Depends on international decisions on Article 6 and

	the timing	ation of the JC (registration and notification)		how countries would modify the bilateral document
				Establishing a carbon management center, connected with the national registry and NFP, might be useful for the operation of Article 6