Q&A

Design and development of a multi-sector registry for environmental attribute certificates

This document includes all questions submitted by parties regarding the Request for Information to develop a cross-sector registry system for commodity environmental attribute credits (EACs) that was published by RMI, the Center for Green Market Activation (GMA), and Mærsk Mc-Kinney Møller Center for Zero Carbon Shipping (MMMCZCS). The RFI closes on November 6, 2026.

1. **Can documentation be made available for the common entry point launched on September 22?**
   The current common entry point uses Auth0 for IAM (Identity and Access Management). You can see it clicking here.

2. **Is the common entry point launched on September 22 intended to be the starting point for the umbrella layer, or will the umbrella layer be built separately?**
   The existing common entry point may serve as a component of the future umbrella system, depending on the proposed architecture and integration approach. The Partners are not prescribing how the existing technology should be incorporated and welcome respondents' recommendations on the most appropriate approach that reduces the administrative burden associated with managing EACs across multiple sectors.

3. **How far has the harmonization of SAFc and Katalist processes and definitions progressed, and is there documentation we can review?**
   Harmonization is still in progress. Near- to medium-term efforts are primarily focused on aligning terminology and simplifying user processes where possible. The existing SAFc and Katalist documentation referenced in the RFI provides the most current and complete description of each registry's requirements and processes.

4. **Section 5 refers to a single umbrella registry provider. Would the Partners also consider separate providers for the umbrella layer and the sectoral registries?**
   The Partners are intentionally not prescribing a single technical architecture or operating model at this stage and are exploring multiple approaches. Respondents should recommend the model they believe would best support a consistent user experience, reduce administrative burden, and enable seamless and efficient expansion to additional sectors.

5. **What is the expected timing for a follow-on solicitation, and is there an indicative budget range?**
   As stated in the RFI, this is intended to provide information to the Partners and should not be interpreted as a commitment to solicit proposals for the development and operation of the umbrella registry at this time. The Partners are still weighing multiple design decisions prior to determining budget, technology partners, and timeline for launch.

6. **Are there requirements for a hosting location? Katalist operates under Danish law; should we assume the same for the umbrella registry, or will that be decided later?**
   The Partners have not established a specific hosting-location requirement. Nevertheless, proposed solutions should support appropriate information security, data integrity and accessibility, and business continuity controls.

   The applicable jurisdiction for the umbrella system and its users has not yet been finalized. The Partners currently anticipate a preference for U.S. jurisdiction for contracts with technology providers, while the jurisdiction applicable to registry users will be determined at a later stage.

7. **Who do the Partners expect to act as the system administrator referred to in section 5: the Partners, the provider, or a third party?**
   The Partners anticipate an operating model that will function as a partnership between the Partners and the umbrella registry software provider, in which the provider performs many of the day-to-day administrative functions with consistent support from the Partners. The exact division of responsibilities, however, is still under consideration. Respondents are encouraged to recommend the operating model they consider most appropriate and explain the rationale.

8. **Section 4f mentions external registries and double counting as a medium-term need. Are you open to responses that look at how that could work across schemes outside book and claim, such as carbon credits and energy certificates?**
   The Partners welcome perspectives and lessons learned from other credit types, though we don't currently have plans to host credits beyond commodity EACs at this time.

9. **Second, how will responses be handled? Is it fine to mark some sections as confidential?**
   RFI responses will be shared exclusively with the three partners listed above (RMI, GMA, MMMCZCS) and will not be published in any other way. Marking sections as confidential is welcome.