

Baku Climate Change Conference Monday, 11 November 2024

The 29th session of the Conference of the Parties (COP 29) to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) ground to halt a mere hour after its launch, with the opening plenary suspended to allow for additional consultations on the meeting agendas. Resumption of the plenary was pushed back several times, leaving delegates idle for most of the day. Eventually, all agendas were adopted and parties even adopted a decision on the Paris Agreement's Article 6.4 Mechanism.

Welcome Remarks

COP 28 President Sultan Al Jaber opened the meeting, emphasizing the need to “unite, act, and deliver.” He called on all parties who can, to contribute to the capitalization of the Loss and Damage Fund, and urged delivering a robust new collective quantified goal (NCQG) on climate finance.

COP 29 President Mukhtar Babayev emphasized that COP 29 is an “unmissable moment” and urged delivering a fair and ambitious NCQG, which sends a strong signal to financial markets. He outlined how operationalizing carbon markets under Paris Agreement Article 6 can help reduce the costs of implementing nationally determined contributions (NDCs). He further underscored that the next round of NDCs should be informed by the outcome of the first Global Stocktake (GST), including with regard to transitioning away from fossil fuels in a just and orderly manner, taking into account national circumstances, pathways, and approaches. “COP 29 cannot and will not be silent on mitigation,” Babayev remarked, pointing to Action Agenda calls on energy grids and methane emissions from organic waste. He additionally recalled that parties are expected to submit their first biennial transparency reports (BTRs) by the end of 2024 and have national adaptation plans in place by 2025.

UNFCCC Executive Secretary Simon Stiell stressed that “climate finance is not charity,” but is in the self-interest of all parties: “If two thirds of the world’s nations cannot afford to cut emissions, every nation pays the price.” Acknowledging that a single COP cannot deliver the full transformation that is needed, he emphasized the need to accelerate the shift to clean energy and climate resilience. He noted the importance of measuring progress

on adaptation and underscored that BTRs will help to avoid “making decisions in the dark.”

Procedural Matters

Rules of Procedure: Parties agreed to apply the draft rules of procedure (FCCC/CP/1996/2), except draft rule 42 on voting. The COP 29 Presidency will hold consultations.

Adoption of the Agendas: President Babayev reported on the pre-session consultations that stretched into the early morning hours of the opening day and continued for more than seven hours after the meeting’s opening ceremony. He proposed to adopt the supplementary provisional agendas without the agenda items suggested for inclusion by parties, with the understanding that the Presidency would convene consultations on:

- mountains, with a high-level event to be organized by the Presidency at COP 29;
- the special needs and circumstances of Africa;
- the seventh review of the Financial Mechanism; and
- climate-related trade-restrictive unilateral measures, in coordination with the Chairs of the Subsidiary Bodies (SBs).

With regard to the COP 29 agenda, President Babayev further noted that the Poznan strategic programme on technology transfer would be discussed under the SBI and the Presidency will undertake consultations on any outstanding matters in the second week. The proposals for amendments to the Convention and on the second review of the adequacy of Convention Article 4.2(a–b) will be held in abeyance.

With regard to the agenda of the sixth COP serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement (CMA 6), President Babayev proposed to retain the item on the dialogue on GST implementation under matters relating to finance, while adding a footnote indicating that the placement of this sub-item on the agenda does not prejudice the scope of consultations on the matter under the SBI. The EU, ALLIANCE OF SMALL ISLAND STATES (AOSIS), UMBRELLA GROUP, ENVIRONMENTAL INTEGRITY GROUP (EIG), LEAST DEVELOPED COUNTRIES (LDCs), and INDEPENDENT ALLIANCE OF LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN (AILAC), accepted the proposal, but expressed their misgivings about attempts to

limit the focus of the dialogue on GST implementation to finance. Most parties underlined that all mandates of the GST decision must be carried forward and reiterated their understanding that adequate space will be provided during CMA 6 for these discussions. The LIKE MINDED DEVELOPING COUNTRIES (LMDCs), AFRICAN GROUP, and ARAB GROUP underlined that the focus of the dialogue on GST implementation is finance, and lamented efforts by some parties to renegotiate agreed outcomes. The LMDCs stressed the dialogue must focus on financial support from developed to developing countries, and on tracking delivery of the NCQG.

BRAZIL, SOUTH AFRICA, INDIA, and CHINA (BASIC) expressed their readiness to work with the Presidency to achieve a collaborative and cooperative outcome. The AFRICAN GROUP called for the SBs to consider the work of the Advisory Board of the Santiago Network, highlighting governance concerns.

Parties agreed to remove matters that will be considered in Presidency consultations from the respective supplementary provisional agendas and to renumber the remaining agenda items accordingly. They adopted:

- the COP supplementary provisional agenda (FCCC/CP/2024/1/Add.2);
- the CMP supplementary provisional agenda (FCCC/KP/CMP/2024/1/Add.1), ;
- the CMA provisional agenda (FCCC/PA/CMA/2024/1/Add.1), with the footnote on the placement of the dialogue on GST implementation;
- the SBI agenda (FCCC/SBI/2024/15/Add.1), with an additional agenda item on the provision of financial and technical support related to reporting and review under article 13 of the Paris Agreement;
- the SBSTA supplementary agenda (FCCC/SBSTA/2024/8/Add.1).

Organization of work under the COP: Contact groups will convene on:

- long-term finance;
- the Standing Committee on Finance (SCF);
- the report of, and guidance to, the Green Climate Fund (GCF);
- the report of, and guidance to, the Global Environment Facility (GEF);
- the report of, and guidance to, the Loss and Damage Fund;
- arrangements between the COP, CMA, and the Loss and Damage Fund Board;
- the periodic review of the long-term global goal under the Convention and of overall progress towards achieving it.

Presidency consultations will convene on:

- dates and venues of future sessions;
- the COP's authority and guidance over the Warsaw International Mechanism (WIM);
- the seventh review of the Financial Mechanism; and
- decision-making in the UNFCCC process.

Organization of work under the CMA: Contact groups will convene on:

- the Work Programme under the Framework for Non-market Approaches referred to in Paris Agreement Article 6.8;
- the NCQG;
- matters relating to the SCF;
- the report of, and guidance to, the GCF;
- the report of, and guidance to, the GEF;
- the report of, and guidance to, the Loss and Damage Fund;
- arrangements between the COP, the CMA, and the Board of the Loss and Damage Fund;
- matters relating to the Adaptation Fund;
- the dialogue on the scope of Paris Agreement Article 2.1(c) and its complementarity with Article 9;
- the report on doubling the collective provision of adaptation finance; and
- the technology implementation programme.

Informal consultations will convene on:

- the report on the annual GST dialogue;
- further guidance on features of NDCs; and
- matters relating to the committee to facilitate implementation and promote compliance.

The CMA forwarded the remaining agenda items to the SBs. Upon the SBs' closing plenaries, the CMA President will propose modalities of work for the second week of the conference.

Organization of work under the CMP: Contact groups will convene on matters relating to the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) and matters relating to the Adaptation Fund. President Babayev reported that views on the report on the high-level ministerial roundtable on increased ambition of Kyoto Protocol commitments remain divergent and parties agreed to further Presidency consultations.

Organization of work under the SBs: Joint informal consultations will convene on:

- procedural and logistical elements of the overall GST process;
- matters relating to the Global Goal on Adaptation;
- report of the Adaptation Committee;
- review of the progress, effectiveness, and performance of the Adaptation Committee;
- 2024 review of the WIM;
- the mitigation ambition and implementation work programme;
- the joint work on implementation of climate action on agriculture and food security; and
- the joint annual report of the Technology Executive Committee and the Climate Technology Centre and Network.

Joint contact groups will convene on: the joint annual report of the WIM Executive Committee (ExCom) and the Santiago Network; the just transition work programme; and the forum on the impact of the implementation of response measures.

The AFRICAN GROUP sought clarification that parties will be able to consider the decisions of the Advisory Board of the Santiago Network. The SBSTA Chair confirmed that the Board's

decisions are part of the Joint Annual Report of the WIM ExCom and Santiago Network, and that all elements of the report can be considered by parties.

The SBI agreed to convene a contact group on administrative, financial, and institutional matters, and deferred the consideration of matters relating to the Adaptation Fund to SBI 62.

The SBI and SBSTA respectively agreed to convene informal consultations on all their remaining substantive items.

Admission of Observers: The COP agreed to admit all listed observers and took note of organizations that changed their names (FCCC/CP/2024/2).

Substantive Matters

Reports of the Subsidiary Bodies: The Co-Chairs of the 2024 Ocean and Climate Change Dialogue reported on the outcomes of the dialogue convened during SB 60 and highlighted the recommendation for parties to include ocean-based mitigation and adaptation action in their NDCs.

Report of, and guidance to, the Loss and Damage Fund: The Co-Chairs of the Loss and Damage Fund Board reported that the Board has completed all the tasks mandated by the COP and CMA to date. They celebrated that the Fund is fully operational and stands ready to work with contributors to turn pledges into contribution agreements.

Rules, Modalities, and Procedures for the Mechanism established by Paris Agreement Article 6.4: President Babayev introduced draft decision FCCC/PA/CMA/2024/L.1, which, *inter alia*, “takes note” of the Article 6.4 Supervisory Body’s adoption of two standards (on [methodologies](#) and on [removals](#)) that operationalize the Article 6.4 Mechanism. He assured parties that work on Article 6.4 would continue in contact group discussions and invited delegates to embrace the decision, which was adopted.

TUVALU noted discomfort with adopting decisions at the opening plenary without prior consultations by the governing bodies and expressed concern that the decision does not reflect the Paris Agreement’s party-driven process.

Final Compilation and Accounting Reports for the Second Commitment Period of the Kyoto Protocol: The CMP took note of the [reports](#) and concluded consideration of this agenda item. Later, BRAZIL, supported by CHINA, requested clarity on what was decided under this sub-item, calling for informal consultations. President Babayev said that the Presidency would provide a space for discussions.

Report of the Compliance Committee of the Kyoto Protocol: The CMP took note of the Committee’s ninth annual report (FCCC/KP/CMP/2024/2).

Report of the administrator of the international transaction log under the Kyoto Protocol: The SBI recommended that CMP take note of the report contained in FCCC/KP/CMP/2024/5.

Research and Systematic Observation: The COMMITTEE ON OBSERVATION SATELLITES (COS) and COORDINATION GROUP FOR METEOROLOGICAL SATELLITES (CGMS) presented their annual reports, calling satellites “vital tools” to

understand the planet. They highlighted the ability to pinpoint high methane leaks from oil and gas facilities.

In the Corridors

The Baku Climate Change Conference opened under a proverbial cloud (the venue’s lack of windows made it difficult for anyone to see if there were actual clouds). Making their way through the venue, people milled about, discussing “how, not whether” the US election would affect climate cooperation. In a press conference, US President Biden’s Senior Advisor for International Climate Policy gave all the reassurances he could that a change of course in the country’s federal administration does not mean the private sector or local administrations will halt efforts toward clean energy expansion. “Very déjà-vu,” noted an observer who remembered the turmoil following Trump’s first election. “He is right that the fight against climate change is bigger than one political cycle,” noted an observer, “but this is the cycle that counts to keep 1.5°C in reach.”

After the glossy opening ceremony with inspirational videos, the meeting ground to a halt because parties could not adopt the agendas. It was not for lack of effort. Heads of delegation were at the venue until 3:00 am on Monday morning. Some thought they were close to an agreement. Evidently, they were not.

What held up most of the day was that parties could not agree on how to follow up on the first Global Stocktake (GST). The GST established a dialogue on implementing the GST outcomes. These are many and wide-ranging, including a call for all parties to contribute to energy transition efforts. The dialogue was established within the finance section of the GST decision, but there is a debate about its scope. Is it about the provision of finance to implement the GST? Or, is it about tracking the implementation of the GST decision more generally? Delegates could not agree on this paragraph’s “origin story” and, therefore, could not find agreement on a way forward. The Presidency shuttled between bilateral meetings with coalitions and parties throughout the day, testing parties’ flexibility to support placing the dialogue under finance, with a footnote that this placement does not prejudice the scope of the dialogue.

Many thought the conference should start by adopting the agendas provisionally, while discussions continued on this one point. That’s what happened at a previous meeting of the Subsidiary Bodies, after all. But, others hinted that this was unacceptable, although accounts varied regarding who it was unacceptable to. Fingers pointed in different directions, spreading the blame for the delay.

In the evening, parties ultimately reached an agreement: The footnote on the GST dialogue made its way onto the agenda and most agenda items proposed for consideration by parties will be taken up in Presidency consultations. Still, the afternoon was lost, in what the COP 29 President called an “unmissable moment” to catalyze climate ambition.

**Follow daily coverage and photos of the
UN Climate Change Conference Baku
UNFCCC COP 29**



 enb.iisd.org

 [subscribe at bit.ly/enbupdate](https://bit.ly/enbupdate)

 [@IISD_ENB](https://twitter.com/IISD_ENB)

 facebook.com/IISD.ENB



Baku Climate Change Conference: Tuesday, 12 November 2024

After a first day full of downtime, awaiting resolution of the agenda discussions, the second conference day was replete with substantive negotiations. Informal consultations launched on a host of issues, with negotiations continuing in the evening and some groups meeting twice in one day. In another part of the venue, Heads of State and Government started delivering their national statements.

Finance

New Collective Quantified Goal: Co-Chair Zaheer Fakir (UAE) opened the contact group under the Conference of the Parties (COP) serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement (CMA), stating that the aim is to produce a text during the first week that resolves technical issues and crystallizes options for ministers. Parties rejected the substantive framework for a draft negotiating text that the Co-Chairs of the *ad hoc* Work Programme on the new collective quantified goal (NCQG) had prepared ahead of the meeting ([FCCC/PA/CMA/2024/9/Add.1](https://fccc.pa/cma/2024/9/Add.1)), although a few suggested it could still be a useful tool.

The G-77/CHINA underlined that provision be from developed to developing countries and that new, additional, adequate, and affordable finance must address mitigation, adaptation, and loss and damage. The US opposed inclusion of loss and damage. Several developed countries objected to including “new principles,” such as burden sharing among developed countries.

On the quantum, the G-77/CHINA called for USD 1.3 trillion per year, with the LEAST DEVELOPED COUNTRIES (LDCs) detailing an allocation floor of USD 220 billion per year for the LDCs, and the ALLIANCE OF SMALL ISLAND STATES (AOSIS) setting the floor at USD 39 billion for small island developing states (SIDS). The INDEPENDENT ALLIANCE OF LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN (AILAC) suggested regional allocation floors. The ENVIRONMENTAL INTEGRITY GROUP (EIG), the EU, JAPAN, and NEW ZEALAND stressed the need to discuss the quantum in the context of the contributor base, instruments, and timelines.

On the structure, AOSIS, the LIKE MINDED DEVELOPING COUNTRIES (LMDCs), and the ARAB GROUP rejected an

investment goal, with some noting it could exacerbate inequalities against countries that traditionally do not attract much investment. The EIG, the EU, NORWAY, AUSTRALIA, JAPAN, the UK, the US, and NEW ZEALAND stressed an investment goal is in addition to the provision and mobilization target, and is necessary to steer investment toward energy transition.

On access, many countries called for greater ambition and detail than in the substantive framework.

On transparency, the G-77/CHINA proposed using the enhanced transparency framework, with AOSIS, the AFRICAN GROUP, the LMDCs, and others, stressing the need for clarity on what is not climate finance, such as export credits.

On recipients, AOSIS, the LDCs, the US, and CANADA, among others, stressed the special circumstances of LDCs and SIDS, with the EU, CANADA, NEW ZEALAND, AUSTRALIA, and BRAZIL underlining the roles and rights of Indigenous Peoples, women and girls, youth, and other vulnerable groups.

Parties mandated the Co-Chairs to produce a draft negotiation text, based on the views expressed and written inputs provided before 5 pm on Tuesday.

Long-Term Finance: The COP contact group was co-chaired by Madeleine Diouf Sarr (Senegal), who invited views on elements of a draft decision. Many developed countries urged acknowledging that the USD 100 billion goal was exceeded in 2022. Others disagreed that the goal was met, with the AFRICAN GROUP observing it is an annual goal, and one year’s results are insufficient. The LDCs, LMDCs, ARAB GROUP, and AILAC observed the lack of a common accounting methodology, which complicates assessing progress toward the goal. They expressed grave concerns that 69% of finance was in the form of loans. The LDCs, AILAC, and CANADA supported a call to scale up adaptation finance.

AOSIS, supported by the AFRICAN GROUP and ARAB GROUP, called for a placeholder in the COP decision to: characterize the NCQG as the successor to the USD 100 billion goal; and accept an invitation from the CMA to track NCQG progress under the long-term finance (LTF) programme. NORWAY, NEW ZEALAND, AUSTRALIA, and other developed countries disagreed, stating that the NCQG is to be defined under the CMA, not the COP. The Co-Chairs will produce a draft text.

Standing Committee on Finance (SCF): In the SBI contact group on the second review of the SCF, co-chaired by Clara Schultz (Sweden), parties could not agree on whether there should be a decision under the COP only or also under the CMA. The Co-Chairs will seek further guidance.

In a joint COP/CMA contact group, co-chaired by Ali Waqas (Pakistan), many welcomed aspects of the SCF's work. On a climate finance definition, the LMDCs called for a multilaterally-agreed definition and the ARAB GROUP suggested a work programme to undertake technical work on this until 2028. GRUPO SUR stressed the need to include developing countries as the recipients of climate finance in the definition. Several developed countries suggested concluding this work, noting this is the second report that identified the multiplicity of approaches and bottom-up nature of the Paris Agreement. Informal consultations will continue.

Dialogue on implementing the Global Stocktake outcomes, referred to in paragraph 97 of decision 1/CMA.5: During CMA informal consultations co-facilitated by Ricardo Marshall (Barbados), parties shared views on the dialogue's scope and modalities, with reassurances that the placement of this agenda item under matters relating to finance does not prejudice either.

On scope, groups reiterated their positions. On modalities, the G-77/CHINA suggested the dialogue be held in "creative and interactive ways" to facilitate exchange of ideas and lessons learned. There was broad agreement for the dialogue to meet annually at the June sessions of the Subsidiary Bodies (SBs), but views diverged on whether it should be under the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI), Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA), or both. Views also differed on the duration of the dialogue. AOSIS and NORWAY stressed that it should not overlap with the second Global Stocktake (GST 2), which begins in 2026, while the EU and AFRICAN GROUP supported for it to end in 2028, which is when GST 2 will conclude. In terms of output, some called for annual reports while others suggested a synthesis report upon the dialogue's conclusion.

Mitigation

Mitigation Ambition and Implementation Work Programme (MWP): In SB informal consultations co-facilitated by Ursula Fuentes (Germany), parties discussed possible elements of a draft decision to be forwarded to the CMA. Many developed and developing countries called for reference to the next round of NDCs delivering on the 1.5°C goal. Several emphasized the need to capture high-level messaging on mitigation from the GST, with some noting this could also be done in a CMA cover decision and others pointing to the discussions on the dialogue on GST implementation as a suitable place. Informal consultations reconvened in the evening.

Guidance on Cooperative Approaches referred to in Paris Agreement Article 6.2: During SBSTA informal consultations co-facilitated by Maria AlJishi (Saudi Arabia) and Peer Stiansen (Norway), parties used draft text developed at SBSTA 60 as the basis of discussions.

The AFRICAN GROUP expressed flexibility about definitions, but noted the need to distinguish between internationally transferred mitigation outcomes (ITMOs) that are to be used for meeting other parties' nationally determined contributions (NDCs) and those to be used for other international purposes.

On the format of authorizations, AOSIS called for minimum mandatory elements and the development of a voluntary template that parties can use. Views remained divergent on the permissibility of changes to authorization, with some parties supporting changes before first transfer, noting authorization is a national prerogative, and others opposing any changes. Informal consultations reconvened in the evening.

Rules, Modalities, and Procedures for the Mechanism established by Paris Agreement Article 6.4: In SBSTA informal consultations, Co-Facilitators Kate Hancock (Australia) and Sonam Tashi (Bhutan) invited views on issues relating to authorization and the mechanism registry. Parties used draft text developed at SBSTA 60 as the basis of discussions.

The AFRICAN GROUP noted there is already a decision about the linkage between the mechanism and international registries, and any new decision must take this into account.

Most parties underlined that the authorization process should be identical or streamlined for both the Article 6.2 cooperative approaches and Article 6.4 mechanism.

AOSIS stressed authorization should be no later than issuance, noting retroactive authorization: will reduce the share of proceeds to the Adaptation Fund; and could result in flooding the market with an oversupply of units if parties "offload" their mitigation contribution units once they have greater certainty about achievement of their NDCs. She made proposals for addressing the issue of the share of proceeds to the Adaptation Fund. The Co-Facilitators will produce a streamlined draft text.

Work Programme under the Framework for Non-market Approaches referred to in Paris Agreement Article 6.8: SBSTA Chair Harry Vreuls (the Netherlands) opened the SBSTA contact group, with the Secretariat highlighting that: there are no non-market approaches (NMAs) recorded on the web-based platform yet; and 78 national focal points have been designated, up from 52 at SBSTA 60. Parties made recommendations for improving the work programme's second phase, including:

- using spinoff groups to deep dive into specific topics, with parties facilitating;
- developing measures to quantify the efficiency of NMAs and how these have supported parties' achievement of their NDCs;
- updating the web-based platform to enable the registration of individual NMAs; and
- clarifying how the web-based platform will perform matchmaking functions.

Adaptation

Matters relating to the Global Goal on Adaptation: In SB informal consultations co-facilitated by Tina Kobilšek (Slovenia), parties discussed progress in defining adaptation indicators (FCCC/SB/2024/6). They agreed that further guidance to the expert group was needed to guide the refined indicator mapping.

There was disagreement on the substance, however. The G-77/CHINA stressed that the indicators should enable tracking of means of implementation, which the EU, UK, JAPAN, and CANADA, among others, rejected. Some delegations advocated dividing the indicators into two sets: binding, global indicators that track progress towards the Global Goal on Adaptation; and context-specific voluntary indicators designed to help parties respond to individual circumstances. The RUSSIAN FEDERATION said both global and local indicators should be voluntary.

Report of the Adaptation Committee: In SB informal consultations, Co-Facilitator Lina Yassin (Sudan) invited parties' views on the report of the Adaptation Committee (AC) ([FCCC/SB/2024/4](#)). The G-77/CHINA called for: increasing participation from all developing countries; strengthening collaboration with organizations from the Global South; translating the AC's knowledge materials into all UN languages; and further training and targeted capacity-building initiatives.

Various groups and countries welcomed the AC's support to the development of indicators for the Global Goal on Adaptation. SAUDI ARABIA called on the Committee not to be distracted by new mandates and to provide support to these only if requested.

Various groups and parties supported mandating the Co-Facilitators to develop draft text, opposed by the AFRICAN GROUP, who called for developing text on screen. The Co-Facilitators will consult with the SB Chairs on the matter.

Review of the progress, effectiveness, and performance of the Adaptation Committee: In SB informal consultations, co-facilitated by Lina Yassin (Sudan), parties debated whether the review should be conducted under the COP only, or also under the CMA. NORWAY proposed a bridging solution, suggesting that this review be finalized through a COP decision, while also initiating a new review under both COP and CMA to better reflect existing mandates. The AFRICAN GROUP, ARAB GROUP, and LMDCs opposed. Parties requested the Secretariat to provide legal guidance on the implications of the proposal.

Loss and Damage

2024 Review of the Warsaw International Mechanism: In a mandated event, many parties expressed disappointment with the WIM's performance thus far, lamenting that it was a "low-ambition and insufficient" mechanism. Developing countries stressed difficulties in using the WIM's outputs due to their "detached, academic jargon" and language barriers. They suggested strengthening bottom-up approaches and involving practitioners, local communities, and Indigenous Peoples more actively. Delegates also proposed, among others, that the WIM produce annual reports on loss and damage needs and gaps.

Other Issues

Poznan strategic programme on technology transfer: In SBI informal consultations, views diverged on how to address matters related to the Poznan strategic programme and the technology implementation programme established in the GST 1 decision. Some suggested addressing all technology concerns under the

technology implementation programme going forward, effectively closing consideration of the Poznan strategic programme. With respect to the operationalization of the technology implementation programme, many supported convening global and regional dialogues. Many developing countries also stressed the need to identify technology priorities to support implementation of NDCs.

Just Transition Work Programme: In an SB contact group co-chaired by Kishan Kumarsingh (Trinidad and Tobago) and Georg Børsting (Norway), parties gave general statements on key elements for inclusion in a draft CMA text. The G-77/CHINA and AOSIS highlighted their support for prioritizing adaptation and, together with AILAC, the LDCs, and the LMDCs, stressed the need to close implementation gaps. The EIG and EU called for a reference to the 1.5°C goal in operative paragraphs and ensuring that NDCs address the issue of just transition to enable action on the ground. The LDCs highlighted the need for skills-building and prioritizing grant-based funding over loans, and requested an assessment mechanism for tracking progress on just transition. The LMDCs highlighted the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities and raised concerns over finance gaps and unilateral trade measures. Informal consultations reconvened in the evening.

Procedural and logistical elements of the overall Global Stocktake process: These SB informal consultations, co-facilitated by Soraya Gargash (UAE) and Patrick Spicer (Canada), drew on an [informal note](#) from SB 60. There was broad agreement for more intersessional work to enhance early party engagement. Parties diverged on alignment between the GST and the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). The EIG supported aligning the IPCC's seventh assessment cycle with GST 2, opposed by the LMDCs, who stressed that "good science takes time" and that aligning the IPCC's work with the GST would be tantamount to "putting the cart before the horse."

Matters relating to the Committee to Facilitate Implementation and Promote Compliance of the Paris Agreement: In CMA informal consultations, parties supported the Committee's recommendation to postpone the review of its modalities and procedures until 2027, owing to the Committee's limited experience to date in implementing them. The Secretariat clarified that it is working towards addressing the Committee's recommendation for updating the NDC registry's archiving procedures to ensure that it reflects which NDC is currently active, as some parties will submit NDCs that will only take effect in 2030 while the previous NDCs remain active.

Provision of financial and technical support to developing countries: In SBI informal consultations, parties welcomed the Secretariat's efforts to provide support for reporting under the Paris Agreement. Developing country groups highlighted, among others:

- issues with regard to the transition between support for reporting under the Convention and the Paris Agreement;
- assessing financing needs to meet enhanced reporting requirements under the Paris Agreement and factoring that into

the next replenishment process under the Global Environment Facility (GEF);

- the need for in-house capacity building in developing countries; and
- delays in resource allocation by the GEF.

The Co-Facilitators will prepare draft text.

Matters related to LDCs: In SBI informal consultations, parties heard a report by the LDC Expert Group (LEG) on its work ([FCCC/SBI/2024/22](#)). The LDCs lamented that no new National Adaptation Plans (NAPs) had been submitted by LDCs in the past year. The LDCs also called for: more support for preparing NAPs; expediting the NAP preparation process; facilitated access to support; and further capacity building for direct access entities. As key elements to include in draft text, the EU identified: welcoming the LEG's work; providing clear modalities for the LEG's mid-term review; and highlighting both concerns and progress related to accessing support. CHINA called for highlighting: how developing countries other than LDCs can learn from LDCs' experiences, and the LEG's work to overcome barriers related to NAP preparation and implementation. Parties mandated the Co-Facilitators to prepare draft text.

Gender: In SBI informal consultations, Co-Facilitators Ruleta Camacho Thomas (Antigua and Barbuda) and Marc-André Lafrance (Canada) recalled that SBI 60 initiated the final review of implementation of the enhanced Lima work programme on gender and its gender action plan (GAP) and that parties agreed to continue this review at SBI 61 on the basis of bracketed draft text from SBI 60. They also invited parties to consider the 2024 report on gender composition ([FCCC/CP/2024/4](#)) and the synthesis report on the implementation of gender-responsive climate policies, plans, strategies and action ([FCCC/CP/2024/5](#)).

BRAZIL, the US, CHILE, CANADA, MEXICO and WOMEN AND GENDER called for considering intersecting and compounding vulnerability factors. Examples cited included age, race, disabilities, sex, and gender diversity. The RUSSIAN FEDERATION noted some terminology, such as gender diversity, is not acceptable to all parties. The AFRICAN GROUP, opposed by CANADA, MEXICO and others, suggested deleting reference to women and girls "in all their diversity" and replacing this with "from local communities."

The AFRICAN GROUP stressed next steps should focus on implementation and, with AOSIS, AILAC, CHINA, and BRAZIL, stressed this must incorporate means of implementation. AOSIS and the PACIFIC SIDS called for simplified access to climate finance for grassroots women and organizations, especially Indigenous Peoples and local communities.

Views diverged on whether to have a 5- or 10-year work programme. The US, YOUNGOs and WOMEN AND GENDER called for a 10-year work programme with a 5-year mid-term review, AUSTRALIA supported a 10-year work programme with a 5-year GAP, and the AFRICAN GROUP preferred a 5-year work programme.

The Co-Facilitators highlighted key areas for further discussion: financing and means of implementation; language on

human rights and diversity; and next steps, including the future work programme.

Research and Systematic Observation: In SBSTA informal consultations co-facilitated by Patricia Nyinguro (Kenya) and Frank McGovern (Ireland), parties suggested a draft decision should refer to, *inter alia*:

- the successful organization of Earth Information Day on 11 November 2024;
- the importance of adaptation and early warning systems;
- the World Meteorological Organization's Global Greenhouse Gas Watch initiative; and
- the work of the IPCC toward a special report on cities.

Several gaps in observation systems and data were pointed out, in particular in relation to the cryosphere, the ocean, and Africa. Parties disagreed over whether to note with concern that 2024 is on track to become the hottest year on record, with many countries supporting a statement to this effect, while the LMDCs opposed, saying that it is not single years, but long-term trends, that matter. Many delegates also highlighted the importance of data-sharing, including of historical archives, while the LMDCs requested more clarity on the scope of such data-sharing.

Administrative, financial, and institutional matters: In an SBI contact group, parties heard a report by the UN Board of Auditors ([FCCC/SBI/2024/INF.7](#) and [Add.1](#)). The EU echoed the auditors' recommendation for the Secretariat to inform and consult parties well in advance on the main elements of future budget cycles, to better take into account their concerns. Parties agreed to take note of the report, as well as those on the status of contributions and fees ([FCCC/SBI/2024/INF.11](#)), and the work programme of the Secretariat for the biennium 2024–2025 ([FCCC/SBI/2024/INF.9](#)).

In the Corridors

In stark contrast to Monday, when delegates sat idly waiting for the agendas to be agreed upon, the second day of the conference featured bustling corridors and coffee queues.

The Leaders' Summit drove some of the foot traffic, and the opening remarks by Azerbaijan's President produced some fireworks. He denounced Western media's "slander campaign" against the host country and recalled that European countries sought out Azerbaijan's fossil fuel reserves to support the continent's energy security in times of crisis.

The negotiations on the new finance goal also drew sparks. Parties rejected the Co-Chairs' text as a starting point. Observers noted that "strange allies" emerged in those discussions: at one point, Saudi Arabia, a frequent recipient of the Fossil of the Day award, quoted from Climate Action Network's Eco.

Seemingly in an attempt to catch up on time lost, informal consultations convened well into the evening, with negotiators focused on issues such as the work programmes on mitigation and just transition meeting twice in one day. Across agenda items, parties gave mandates for the preparation of draft text—"surprisingly quickly for the process," as one exhausted delegate noted leaving into the night.

Baku Climate Change Conference Wednesday, 13 November 2024

Finance negotiators once again met for back-to-back sessions throughout the day, including to consider progress in the operationalization of the new Loss and Damage Fund. Heads of State and Government continued providing statements in the high-level segment and the plenary resumed for opening statements.

Resumed Opening Plenary

The G-77/CHINA underscored that all implementation requires access to means of implementation, highlighting its calls for a balanced new collective quantified goal on climate finance (NCQG) that is responsive to developing countries' needs and for a technology implementation programme supported by the operating entities of the Financial Mechanism.

The EU called for the conference to show countries' collective response to climate change through implementing the Global Stocktake (GST) in its entirety, progressing on mitigation and adaptation, and adopting an NCQG with a broadened contributor base that supports the most vulnerable.

The ENVIRONMENTAL INTEGRITY GROUP (EIG) observed that one year after agreeing to transition away from fossil fuels, fossil fuel subsidies are ten times the magnitude of climate finance. They called for an NCQG that is fit for the scale of countries' needs and the transformation ahead, and which "pushes and pulls" capital to where it is most needed.

The UMBRELLA GROUP called for "unequivocal resolve" to follow-up on the GST outcome. They said the NCQG should be multilayered, with a core of billions in support provided and mobilized, complemented by trillions in investment, and called on those with capacity to step up.

BRAZIL, SOUTH AFRICA, INDIA, and CHINA underlined that it is time to fully and effectively implement the Convention and its Paris Agreement, and rejected attempts by developed countries to weaken their responsibility to provide finance.

The ARAB GROUP highlighted the key role of the NCQG for implementing the GST outcomes and ensuring just transition. He stressed the importance of dealing with the negative impacts of response measures and called for operationalization of Article 6 in a balanced and efficient manner.

The AFRICAN GROUP underscored public finance as the core of the NCQG, expressing concern over attempts to renegotiate the contributor and recipient base. He lamented the prohibitive cost of capital and emphasized ensuring debt sustainability.

The Like-Minded Group of Developing Countries (LMDCs) said public finance is key to the NCQG and objected to the notion

of a layered goal. He called on developed countries to fulfill their obligations and ensure increased finance, including for adaptation, loss and damage, and the Climate Technology Centre and Network (CTCN).

The LEAST DEVELOPED COUNTRIES (LDCs) called for enhancing the capitalization of the Loss and Damage Fund and for the NCQG to meet LDCs' needs with respect to mitigation, adaptation, and loss and damage, with finance being predominantly grant-based. He called for a clear definition of what counts as climate finance.

GRUPO SUR emphasized that developing countries' ambition is contingent upon developed countries' provision of financial, technical, and capacity-building support, not the other way around, and objected to discussions on donor base expansion.

The MOUNTAIN PARTNERSHIP emphasized threats related to melting mountain glaciers, both locally and with respect to sea-level rise, and welcomed the convening of Presidency consultations on mountains to foster progress on the matter.

The INTERGOVERNMENTAL PANEL ON CLIMATE CHANGE (IPCC) emphasized the importance of systematic observation to understand climate change trends. He highlighted that the IPCC is striving to engage more women and early career scientists in its seventh assessment process and recognized the need to include diverse perspectives, such as those of Indigenous Peoples. GLOBAL CLIMATE OBSERVING SYSTEM (GCOS) stressed maintaining in-situ observation stations and data archives, and called on parties to continue observations on glaciers, ensure historic data availability, and appoint national GCOS coordinators. The WORLD METEOROLOGICAL ORGANIZATION (WMO) highlighted the role of the Global Greenhouse Gas Watch initiative in providing data to inform decision making and called for increased funding to the Systematic Observations Financing Facility. WORLD CLIMATE RESEARCH PROGRAMME outlined its many projects, including upcoming work to fill knowledge gaps in global precipitation, with a focus on freshwater regions.

The INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION ORGANIZATION (ICAO) reported on the deployment of sustainable aviation fuels, called for Article 6 operationalization, and warned that taxation on aviation would affect connectivity in developing countries.

CLIMATE ACTION NETWORK underlined that countries seem intent on "pouring fuel on the fire" and stressed that the commitments from Dubai mean nothing if countries do not put their money where their mouth is. DEMAND CLIMATE JUSTICE decried carbon markets as illegitimate, and denounced

prioritization of funding for the arms industry at the expense of lives and emissions reductions.

FARMERS situated themselves on the frontlines, urged parties for recognition in discussions on agriculture, nationally determined contributions (NDCs), the NCQG, and Loss and Damage Fund, and stressed that carbon markets must protect farmers' rights. INDIGENOUS PEOPLES lamented that states have failed to act while imposing false solutions such as Article 6 and geoengineering, equating these actions to genocide and ecocide. They stressed the need to stop conflating Indigenous Peoples with local communities.

LOCAL GOVERNMENTS AND MUNICIPAL AUTHORITIES called on parties to set and achieve more ambitious NDCs in partnership with the "indispensable" subnational governments. RESEARCH AND INDEPENDENT NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS (NGOs) outlined documented rises in fossil fuel use. They urged parties to center science for a transformational trajectory that ensures the security and resilience of all people and nature.

WOMEN AND GENDER lamented the lack of political will from parties, particularly on the Lima work programme on gender, which has failed to realize gender-just climate action. They challenged the "myth of financial scarcity," given that carbon markets and climate inaction enrich the few at the expense of the Global South. CHILDREN AND YOUTH explained how developed countries' failure to provide their fair share of finance violates the rights of future generations. They expressed outrage at their marginalization at the expense of Presidency-chosen Youth Climate Champions and COPs that continue to propagate fossil fuel exploitation.

TRADE UNION NGOs relayed how 2.4 million workers, from factories to fields, are at risk from climate-related hazards. They underscored how grant-based finance can realize systematic change that protects human rights and workers' rights, and a just transition that is the hope for survival. BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY NGOs viewed finalizing Article 6 as crucial to this COP's success and viewed the decision already taken as a step in the right direction, citing additional work required on the NCQG to provide the signals to business and investment sectors.

Finance

NCQG: These informal consultations under the Conference of the Parties (COP) serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement (CMA) were co-facilitated by Fiona Gilbert (Australia). Parties welcomed the new draft text as a basis for discussions and requested the Co-Facilitators to streamline the document to remove duplication, while not deleting any ideas. The EIG and EU suggested informal discussions on access, transparency, and rights-based language. The ARAB GROUP rejected producing text through informal-informal consultations.

Matters relating to the Standing Committee on Finance (SCF): In the joint COP/CMA contact group, co-chaired by Clara Schultz (Sweden) and Ali Waqas (Pakistan), parties continued their initial exchange on expectations for a decision.

On the Biennial Assessment, the US and NEW ZEALAND called for highlighting key recommendations, particularly on Paris Agreement Article 2.1c (finance flow alignment), which the AFRICAN GROUP suggested is a duplication of work, given ongoing discussions under the Dialogue on the scope of Article 2.1c. The LDCs suggested including loss and damage in the next Assessment.

On a common climate finance definition, the LDCs and AFRICAN GROUP called for further work, noting the SCF did not provide recommendations. The US, CANADA, and NEW ZEALAND preferred no further work given the SCF's workload, observing that the Committee could not complete its work on guidance to the Green Climate Fund (GCF) and Global Environment Facility (GEF). The Co-Chairs will produce draft decision texts.

Report of, and guidance to, the Green Climate Fund: In a COP contact group, co-chaired by Pierre Marc (France), parties called for streamlining the [elements](#) for a draft decision compiled by the SCF. The AFRICAN GROUP emphasized welcoming the GCF's success in leveraging private sector resources and encouraging developed country contributors to enable the Fund to manage USD 50 billion by 2030. The US and CANADA noted the guidance should be directed to the GCF, not parties. The EU supported the proposal to move from annual to biennial guidance to the GCF.

Other comments related to, among others: enhanced coherence and complementarity with other funds; prioritizing high-impact proposals; expediting readiness support; ensuring monitoring of multi-country projects on a per-country basis; expeditiously accrediting and prioritizing direct access entities; lack of geographical diversity among GCF staff; and establishing a regional GCF presence in Latin America and the Caribbean. The Co-Chairs welcomed written submissions and will prepare a streamlined draft text.

In the CMA contact group, the ARAB GROUP emphasized welcoming the outcome on the NCQG and calling on developed countries to expeditiously increase their contributions in line with the agreed quantum, and objected to language on finance flow consistency. The Co-Chairs welcomed written submissions and will prepare a streamlined draft text.

Report of, and guidance to, the Global Environment Facility: In a COP contact group, co-chaired by David Kaluba (Zambia), parties called for streamlining the SCF's elements for draft guidance. The INDEPENDENT ALLIANCE OF LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN (AILAC) underscored the need to provide guidance on the next replenishment, with the ARAB GROUP emphasizing it should be commensurate to developing countries' needs and EGYPT calling for at least a doubling compared to the eighth replenishment. The ARAB GROUP noted the need for continued support for reporting under the Convention. The EU supported a proposal to move from annual to biennial guidance to the GEF.

Other comments related to enhancing, among others: support and accessibility of support for LDCs and small island developing states (SIDS); linkages between the Financial Mechanism and the Technology Mechanism; gender responsiveness; and coherence with other funds, including with respect to accreditation processes. The Co-Chairs welcomed written submissions and will prepare a streamlined draft text.

Report of, and guidance to, the Loss and Damage Fund: In the COP contact group, Co-Chair Amena Yauvoli (Fiji), invited comments on elements for a draft decision on the report ([CP/2024/9-CMA/2024/13](#), and [Adds.1](#)). Parties were positive about the Board's work, including finalizing arrangements with the World Bank and selecting the Philippines as the host country.

The EIG, the US, the EU, the UK, NEW ZEALAND, CANADA, NORWAY, and AUSTRALIA preferred a procedural draft decision welcoming the Board's report and work, without specifying further guidance.

Many developing countries identified substantive elements for the decision, particularly on the long-term resource mobilization strategy. The AFRICAN GROUP stressed the Fund should respond to developing countries' needs, and AILAC underscored that all developing countries should be eligible to access the Fund. The ARAB GROUP suggested urging developed countries to provide support. AILAC, INDIA, and EGYPT stressed the need to turn pledges into contribution agreements, with the ALLIANCE OF SMALL ISLAND STATES (AOSIS) noting that current pledges are insufficient. The Co-Chairs will prepare a draft decision to adopt the arrangements under the COP and, given no additional comments were provided, under the CMA.

Arrangements between the COP, CMA, and the Board of the Loss and Damage Fund: In the COP contact group, co-chaired by Jose Delgado (Austria), parties stated their willingness to approve the draft arrangements recommended by the SCF ([CP/2024/6/Add.8](#), [CMA/2024/8/Add.8](#)). AOSIS underlined its understanding that the Fund, as an operating entity of the Financial Mechanism, would be subject to periodic review of the Mechanism. The Co-Chairs will prepare a draft decision to adopt the arrangements under the COP and, given no additional comments were provided, under the CMA.

Matters relating to the Adaptation Fund (AF): In CMP and CMA contact groups, co-chaired by Ralph Bodle (Germany) and Isatou Camara (the Gambia), parties discussed elements of both the COP serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP) and CMA decisions. AILAC and the LDCs urged recognition of the need to scale up adaptation finance.

Views diverged on the AF Board's work to transition to the Fund exclusively serving the Paris Agreement. The EU, the EIG, the UK, the US, and CANADA foresaw that share of proceeds from the Article 6.4 Mechanism will soon be available and called for the Board to amend and adopt the relevant statutory documents.

The ARAB GROUP, LMDCs, and AFRICAN GROUP said this work cannot be finalized until the CMP and CMA confirm that share of proceeds are available, and called for clarity on how those would be made available.

The Board Secretariat reported that work related to the transition is ongoing, and the World Bank, as trustee, requested that the documents be confidential until they are finalized. The AFRICAN GROUP recalled its wider questions about the trustee arrangements.

Dialogue on the scope of Paris Agreement Article 2.1c and its complementarity with Article 9: In the CMA contact group, co-chaired by Elena Pereira Colindres (Honduras) and Ben Abraham (New Zealand), parties sought to identify elements for a draft decision.

GRUPO SUR, the LDCs, the AFRICAN GROUP, AILAC, the ARAB GROUP, the LMDCs, and the RUSSIAN FEDERATION observed views remain divergent on the interpretation of Article 2.1c, while the US, AUSTRALIA, and the UK thought a collective understanding was emerging. The ARAB GROUP, the LMDCs, and KENYA stressed adopting a procedural decision given the differing interpretations.

Several developing countries cited challenges referenced in the report, such as high costs of capital and debt levels, and limited fiscal space. AOSIS stressed that the workshops convened under the dialogue so far held little relevance to SIDS, particularly the presentations by external organizations.

On future topics for the dialogue, there was emerging consensus for additional adaptation discussions, although the

ARAB GROUP said the decision should not identify future topics. The EIG and EU supported work on tracking progress. The EU suggested discussing the role of the international financial system. CANADA called for further work on the challenges of LDCs and SIDS. AUSTRALIA suggested a focus on smaller economies. The Co-Chairs will prepare a draft decision.

Dialogue on implementing the GST outcomes, referred to in paragraph 97 of decision 1/CMA.5: In informal consultations under the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI), Co-Facilitator Ricardo Marshall (Barbados) noted divergent views on the scope, and suggested this session focus on modalities, taking as a basis the [informal note](#) from SB 60.

AILAC said the dialogue should facilitate discussions under each thematic area of the GST by addressing: collective progress in implementing the calls outlined in the GST decision; barriers and challenges hindering such progress, particularly in relation to means of implementation; and what additional commitments are necessary to close gaps. The LMDCs emphasized the dialogue should track progress in the delivery of the NCQG and inform its revision. The EU encouraged discussions on the modalities, suggesting the dialogue's scope be addressed at a higher level.

The Co-Facilitators will prepare an informal note.

Mitigation

Guidance on Cooperative Approaches referred to in Paris Agreement Article 6.2: In informal consultations spanning the entire morning, co-facilitated by Peer Stiansen (Norway) and Maria Al Jishi (Saudi Arabia), parties proposed ways to streamline the draft text from SBSTA 60.

On the process for identifying and addressing inconsistencies in reporting, including by the Article 6 technical expert reviews, countries debated at length the prescriptiveness of guidance on what constitutes a "significant" or "persistent" inconsistency. The UK proposed linking the definition of "significant" to double counting, while the EU saw the need for a broader, "graded" definition. Many favored giving the reviewers leeway to define these terms. AOSIS called for addressing inconsistencies in both quantitative and qualitative information. The LMDCs cautioned against introducing new terms, such as "material inconsistencies."

Various parties also stressed the need to detail a link to trigger liaison with the Paris Agreement Implementation and Compliance Committee in certain cases of inconsistencies identified by the reviewers. Many, including AILAC, GRUPO SUR, the EU, and the AFRICAN GROUP, supported text on halting the transfer of and use toward NDCs of internationally transferred mitigation outcomes (ITMOs) where inconsistencies are identified.

On additional functionalities and procedures for the international registry, parties noted that major differences in views remained, with many clarifying their positions or suggesting potential ways to bridge diverging views. The US opposed any functions beyond those of tracking and recording data on party actions relating to ITMOs, cautioning that expanding the functions would require an extensive work programme and could lead to parties having to reformulate national arrangements to align with those of the international registry. Noting the group is not calling for the registry to perform issuances, the AFRICAN GROUP stressed allowing countries that do not have registries to use the international registry for functions such as authorization, transfers, and use of credits. Similar views were shared by GRUPO SUR, AOSIS and the LDCs. NEW ZEALAND suggested differentiating between ITMOs, for which these functions could be enabled in the international registry, and mitigation outcomes, for which

only “pull and view” would be made available, noting that the international registry only serves ITMOs. Many stressed the need for capacity building support to enable parties to develop national registries.

Parties mandated the Co-Facilitators to develop a new iteration of text.

Rules, Modalities, and Procedures for the Mechanism established by Paris Agreement Article 6.4: During the CMA contact group, Co-Chairs Kate Hancock (Australia) and Sonam Tashi (Bhutan) invited parties to consider the Article 6.4 Supervisory Body’s annual report to the CMA ([FCCC/PA/CMA/2024/2](#) and [Add.1](#)) and propose elements of a draft CMA decision. The COALITION FOR RAINFOREST NATIONS (CfRN) condemned the “horrible precedent” set by the Supervisory Body’s adoption of the Article 6.4 methodologies and removals guidelines, rather than fulfilling its mandate to elaborate and recommend the guidelines for the CMA to adopt. ENVIRONMENTAL NGOs (ENGOs) and TRADE UNION NGOs lamented the Supervisory Body’s governance breach and called for guidance to ensure the integrity of the mechanism.

On elements for a draft CMA decision, the EU and AFRICAN GROUP recommended a mode of work where the Supervisory Body Chair gives an oral report to the CMA in addition to the written annual report. The LDCs supported exempting LDCs from payment of the share of proceeds for adaptation. GRUPO SUR supported addressing the transition of Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) afforestation and reforestation projects to the Article 6.4 mechanism. AILAC supported guidance relating to a post-crediting monitoring period and JAPAN called for work on baseline tools and implementation of the mechanism registry.

The Co-Chairs will prepare a draft text.

Work Programme under the Framework for Non-market Approaches (NMAs) referred to in Paris Agreement Article 6.8: During the SBI contact group, Co-Chairs Kristin Qui (Trinidad and Tobago) and Jacqui Ruesga (New Zealand) introduced new draft text, noting it includes an assessment of the work programme’s first phase, recommendations for phase two, and matters relating to the web-based platform and capacity building.

On phase one assessment, the LMDCs clarified their proposal to include a quantitative assessment of how NMAs have helped countries implement their NDCs. The CFRN and the LMDCs urged continued consideration of phase one topics even during phase two, saying these have not been properly addressed.

On phase two recommendations, most parties, including the ARAB GROUP, the EU, the US, TÜRKIYE, and others, opposed including additional focus areas. Several parties also questioned the listing of topics for spinoff groups, preferring for parties to continue identifying topics as and when necessary. The CfRN, EU, and others, opposed reference to “Mother Earth Centric Actions,” while the LMDCs underlined the need to promote joint mitigation and adaptation action.

On the web-based platform and capacity building, the CfRN suggested that the survey for national focal points to flag barriers to using the platform be extended to non-party stakeholders, such as service providers already registered on the platform.

The Co-Chairs will produce a new iteration of the draft text.

Further guidance on NDC features: During the CMA informal consultations co-facilitated by Sin Liang Cheah (Singapore) and Federica Fricano (Italy), parties expressed

their views about what further guidance, if any, is required on the features of NDCs. Several, including the LDCs and the REPUBLIC OF KOREA, called for clarifying what guidance on features of NDCs there currently is before determining if further guidance is required. The AFRICAN GROUP and NORWAY pointed at current guidance in Paris Agreement Article 4 (NDCs) and Decision 4/CMA.1 (further guidance in relation to the mitigation section of decision 1/CP.21), and said no further guidance is required.

The ARAB GROUP and the REPUBLIC OF KOREA stressed any further guidance cannot contradict the Paris Agreement. Parties stressed the nationally-determined nature of NDCs and INDIA opposed introduction of top-down elements “in the guise of features.”

Other parties supported further guidance, noting common features can be identified from parties’ experience with submitting and implementing NDCs. The EU, AOSIS, and the LDCs identified economy-wide targets. JAPAN and the US called for quantification by all parties, and, with the LDCs but opposed by INDIA, supported alignment with the 1.5°C goal. The LDCs called for closing the finance gap to implement NDCs and clarity of NDC timelines. The LMDCs noted most NDCs are conditional and identified this as a feature of NDCs.

The Co-Chairs will consult with the Presidency on the way forward.

Adaptation

Matters relating to the Global Goal on Adaptation (GGA): SB informal discussions were co-facilitated by Lamin Dibba (the Gambia). Parties debated how to follow up on paragraph 38 of decision 2/CMA.5, which calls for the SBs to initiate consideration of matters relating to the GGA with a view to recommending a decision to CMA 7. Disagreements emerged over: whether to enter into focused discussions on the matter at this session or later; inputs on the GGA to future GSTs; and when to commence review of the GGA Framework, especially with regard to the timing of GST 2. Parties welcomed the technical paper on transformational adaptation ([FCCC/TP/2024/8](#)) prepared by the Secretariat, with some lamenting its late publication. Debates further touched upon: the need for a standalone agenda item on the GGA beyond CMA 7; the role of Convention principles in guiding work on the GGA; and avoiding duplication and overlap with other processes.

The Co-Facilitators will produce a draft text.

Report of the Adaptation Committee: In SB informal consultation, co-facilitated by Lina Yassin (Sudan), the AFRICAN GROUP insisted on projecting on screen the recommendations to the COP and CMA contained in the Committee’s report ([FCCC/SB/2024/4](#)) to allow for textual negotiations. The EU, AUSTRALIA, the US, and CANADA objected, preferring to mandate the Co-Facilitators to prepare draft text first. The Co-Facilitators will consult the SB Chairs on how to move forward.

National Adaptation Plans: In SBI informal consultations, Co-Facilitator Meredith Ryder-Rude (US) introduced a color-coded and annotated update to the [informal note](#) developed at SBI 60, prompting huddles for parties to coordinate. When consultations resumed, the G-77/CHINA stated it did not agree with some of the color codes and annotations, and requested for the informal note from SBI 60 to be projected on screen for parties to propose textual edits. The EU, NORWAY, and the US opposed this, warning that doing so would mean “taking a step back” and

preferred requesting the Co-Facilitators to streamline the informal note before considering textual edits.

The Co-Facilitators noted that the discussions had reached an impasse and urged parties to consult informally.

Loss and Damage

Joint annual report of the Executive Committee (ExCom) of the Warsaw International Mechanism for Loss and Damage associated with Climate Change Impacts (WIM) and the Santiago Network: In SB informal consultations, co-facilitated by Pasha Carruthers (Cook Islands) and Farhan Akhtar (US), parties called for a single decision to address both the joint report ([FCCC/SB/2024/2](#)) and the 2024 WIM review. The AFRICAN GROUP stressed that any decision should respect the distinction between, and independence of, the WIM ExCom and the Santiago Network.

Parties welcomed significant advances in operationalizing the Santiago Network. AILAC called for the swift establishment of regional offices, with the AFRICAN GROUP calling for at least two to be located in Africa. The LDCs emphasized the distinction between funding for the Santiago Network and pledges to the Loss and Damage Fund. AILAC and the AFRICAN GROUP urged delivery of outstanding pledges to the Network.

2024 Review of the WIM: In SB informal consultations, co-facilitated by Pasha Carruthers (Cook Islands), parties suggested text for inclusion in a draft decision. Opinions converged on the need to increase the accessibility of the WIM's knowledge products, including by translating them into all UN languages, and for coordination and coherence among the WIM, the Santiago Network, and the Loss and Damage Fund, as well as with the broader institutional landscape on loss and damage.

AOSIS and the AFRICAN GROUP called for the WIM to prepare regular reports on the global state of loss and damage, while AUSTRALIA and the UK requested further details on the specific rationale for, and potential content of, such a report.

AILAC and the LDCs underscored that the WIM has achieved little progress in relation to its third function: action and support. Delegates agreed that the role of the WIM's Expert Group on Action and Support, as well as that of the national loss and damage contact points, should be reviewed.

The Co-Facilitators will prepare an informal note synthesizing views expressed.

Other Issues

Linkages between the Technology Mechanism and the Financial Mechanism: During the SBI informal consultations, Co-Facilitator Stephen Minas (Greece) noted SBI 60 agreed to continue consideration of this item at SBI 61, taking into account the draft text from SBI 60, and invited comments on elements for a draft COP decision.

Parties expressed diverging views on how to proceed, debating what "taking into account" means. The G-77/CHINA supported using the text to move forward with discussions. JAPAN preferred starting afresh. The UK and EU suggested, among others: welcoming the report on the in-session workshop held at SBI 60 ([FCCC/SBI/2024/16](#)) and to the synthesis report on maintaining and enhancing collaboration and cooperation between them ([FCCC/SBI/2024/1](#)); identifying examples of enhanced collaboration; and encouraging continued collaboration. The EU also proposed encouraging the CTCN to enhance strategic alignment with GCF and GEF programming.

Parties ultimately gave the Co-Facilitators the mandate to prepare draft text which incorporates both the SBI 60 draft text and views expressed during the session.

Poznan strategic programme on technology transfer: SBI informal consultations were co-facilitated by Duduzile Nhlegentwa-Masina (Eswatini) and Stig Svenningsen (Norway). Parties deliberated whether to conclude consideration of the matter at this COP, with many noting that no new projects were launched under the strategic programme since 2014 and the two last projects running are ending in 2024. They supported continuing technology discussions under the technology implementation programme established in the GST decision. The G-77/CHINA considered this premature, given the new programme has yet to be operationalized. The EU, UK, and US suggested the new programme will help to both identify and address technology needs. CANADA noted that the continuation or not of the strategic programme falls under the authority of the SCF. Informal consultations continued in the evening.

Research and Systematic Observation: In informal consultations under the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA), co-facilitated by Patricia Nyinguro (Kenya) and Frank McGovern (Ireland), parties welcomed the draft decision text. Debates centered on a reference to 2024 being the hottest year on record, which many considered "absolutely necessary." The LMDCs suggested the statement is misleading and that warming trends have to be viewed in light of cumulative historic emissions.

AOSIS welcomed the reference to delivering universal access to early warning systems, particularly for "vulnerable regions," suggesting to further specify it be prioritized for SIDS and LDCs. The LMDCs suggested delivering early warning systems, particularly to "developing countries," with a prioritization of vulnerable regions.

The Co-Facilitators will revise the draft decision text.

In the Corridors

A major debate in the corridors, on the floors, was the quality of the various coffee options. Like the negotiations at this stage, there was no resolution. The negotiations sure seem to add weight to the coffee debate. In multiple rooms, negotiators asked their Co-Facilitators to spend another sleepless night revising draft texts. The Co-Facilitators of discussions on the new finance goal waded through 65 pages of written inputs to produce the "monster" 34-page draft. Also in finance, the US twice requested for more time to provide their written inputs. "I'm glad someone asked," remarked a negotiator from the group of least developed countries.

Article 6.2 negotiators proved remarkably efficient. Perhaps they were inspired by the Article 6.4 decision on Monday, which one long-time negotiator called "reason to celebrate," but observers and the Coalition for Rainforest Nations condemned it in the resumed opening plenary. Elsewhere, one observer noted a "concerted, coordinated effort" to ensure that calls for finance to address technology needs "pop up" across agenda items. "It's key," she stressed, "as this could lead to some real improvements on the ground."

Messaging from a number of high-level dignitaries also made waves. "Azerbaijan picked a fight with France, Italy is dreaming of nuclear fusion, and Argentina commandeered its delegation back home" recounted a stunned delegate, "that's a bit too much drama for one day."

**Follow daily coverage and photos of the
UN Climate Change Conference Baku
UNFCCC COP 29**



enb.iisd.org



subscribe at bit.ly/enbupdate



[@IISD_ENB](https://twitter.com/IISD_ENB)



facebook.com/IISD.ENB



Baku Climate Change Conference: Thursday, 14 November 2024

The day's negotiations were noticeably protracted. Discussions on adaptation were marked by such contention that they prompted an intervention by the Chair of the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI). A ministerial dialogue on finance underscored the magnitude of the divergence of views on the new finance goal to be defined in Baku.

Finance

New collective quantified goal (NCQG): In informal consultations under the Conference of the Parties (COP) serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement (CMA), Co-Chair Zaheer Fakir (UAE) presented a revised draft text. He acknowledged it is not much shorter than the previous version, emphasizing that there are areas that could benefit from further work, but this would exceed the Co-Chairs' mandate to remove duplication. The G-77/CHINA asked the Co-Chairs to consult with groups to inform further streamlining before engaging in further substantive discussions in informal consultations.

Many developed countries expressed frustration at the lack of engagement in the informal discussions on Wednesday and cited areas where merging text was possible, including on rights-based language and transparency. The meeting was suspended to allow time for the G-77/China to coordinate.

Dialogue on implementing the Global Stocktake (GST) outcomes, referred to in paragraph 97 of decision 1/CMA.5: In SBI informal consultations, co-facilitated by Patrick Spicer (Canada), countries continued to react to an informal note outlining the dialogue's potential scope and modalities.

On scope, there was some converging interest in exploring the middle-ground option that the dialogue considers the implementation of all GST outcomes, particularly means of implementation, which the INDEPENDENT ALLIANCE OF LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN (AILAC), ALLIANCE OF SMALL ISLAND STATES (AOSIS), and the LEAST DEVELOPED COUNTRIES (LDCs) specified should split out finance as a key means of implementation. INDIA worried that attention to finance could be diluted if there was a wide scope. The EU, ENVIRONMENTAL INTEGRITY GROUP (EIG), UK and US preferred to address all GST outcomes that are not covered through existing mandates, with the US characterizing this as a relatively constrained set of outcomes.

The EU, EIG, UK, and US called for removing the NCQG from the dialogue's scope, saying it is not a GST outcome. The LIKE MINDED DEVELOPING COUNTRIES (LMDCs), the ARAB GROUP, and EGYPT stressed the NCQG's importance, citing its reference in the GST.

On modalities, the PHILIPPINES, NORWAY, and many others cautioned against creating a "mini-GST." The EIG called for streamlined options for ministers to consider. NORWAY and the UK did not envision high-level dialogues, while the LMDCs and UK did not see a need for extensive inputs.

The Co-Facilitators will revise their informal note.

Sixth High-Level Ministerial Dialogue on Climate Finance: Executive Secretary Simon Stiell opened this mandated event

emphasizing the need to deliver accessible and predictable finance that is commensurate with the challenges faced by developing countries. The session featured statements by various groups and countries. Among others:

- AOSIS underscored that small island developing states (SIDS) and LDCs are struggling to navigate the "opaque and convoluted" climate finance architecture, with the lack of coordination between funds creating unnecessary barriers;
- the EU underscored the need to broaden the contributor base to all countries in a position to do so, including emerging economies, and leverage innovative sources, pointing to the Task Force for the Global Mobilization Against Climate Change launched under the G20;
- CHINA emphasized that developed countries must continue to fulfill their obligations and take the lead in mobilizing climate finance, with the NCQG and voluntary support provided through South-South cooperation mutually reinforcing each other;
- SWEDEN noted it is the largest per-capita donor to the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and the Green Climate Fund (GCF) and announced pledges of USD 763 million to the GCF's second replenishment and USD 19 million to the Loss and Damage Fund;
- COLOMBIA underscored that lack of progress on mitigation means more must be invested to address loss and damage, and emphasized that developing countries' lack of fiscal space impedes just transition;
- the SOLOMON ISLANDS called for addressing the issue of fossil fuel subsidies in the context of the mitigation work programme and discussions on Paris Agreement Article 2.1c (finance flow alignment), emphasizing this is key to keep the 1.5°C goal alive;
- AILAC said discussions on Article 2.1c should promote a reform of the international financial system to ensure that developing countries are not forced into further economic instability, and highlighted direct access provisions as key to overcoming bottlenecks in access to finance;
- Germany emphasized the need to signal to financial markets that "the age of fossil fuels is over," boost the lending capacity of multilateral development banks, and leverage innovative sources of finance, such as levies that ensure that polluters pay;
- the US noted that the USD 100 billion goal did not draw on the full set of countries that are able to contribute and suggested the new goal can address this through a pragmatic approach that does not rely on criteria and is in line with Paris Agreement Article 9 (finance); and
- CANADA emphasized the need for a global investment layer in the NCQG to ramp up climate-friendly investment by all actors.

Mitigation

Mitigation Ambition and Implementation Work

Programme (MWP): In informal consultations under the Subsidiary Bodies (SBs), Co-Facilitators Ursula Fuentes (Germany) and Maesela John Kekana (South Africa) invited views on an informal note they prepared based on bilateral consultations. The LMDCs, supported by the AFRICAN GROUP and ARAB

GROUP, welcomed the effort that went toward preparing the note, but objected to using it as a basis of discussion and suggested further expressions of views on expectations towards draft text. The Co-Facilitators clarified their call for guidance on parties' expectations in terms of structure and further elements to include.

On structure, the LMDCs called for a text that distinguishes between: elements on which convergence can be found, such as guidance on future global dialogues and investment-focused events, and procedural arrangements for future calls for submissions; and issues of divergence, such as high-level messages from the GST. The ARAB GROUP called for distinguishing between elements that are in line with previous decisions and new elements.

In terms of substance, the LMDCs and ARAB GROUP emphasized, among others: enhancing the party-driven nature of the topic selection; balanced representation of developed and developing countries, including on panels; and discontinuing the use of breakout groups. The ARAB GROUP also called for assessing developed countries' delivery of finance and technology transfer. The REPUBLIC OF KOREA opposed any backtracking compared to previous MWP decisions, and noted that the consideration of the GST outcome's mitigation elements does not preclude the consideration of other elements at future dialogues.

Informal consultations continued in the evening.

Further guidance on NDC features: In CMA informal consultations, Co-Facilitator Sin Liang Cheah (Singapore) requested a mandate to produce an informal note.

CHILE, supported by the AFRICAN GROUP, NORWAY, the RUSSIAN FEDERATION, and INDIA, supported suspending this issue until 2029 when there will be more experience with NDCs and the second GST will have concluded. The EU, the UK, and AUSTRALIA disagreed, noting the need for guidance in the near-term. JAPAN suggested guidance would be required by 2028 in advance of the 2030 NDC submissions. The AFRICAN GROUP preferred a "no text" option for this agenda item, with GRUPO SUR and the ARAB GROUP, reminding that NDCs, and guidance thereon, include adaptation, loss and damage, and means of implementation, as well as mitigation.

While all acknowledged that there are different views on what constitutes an NDC feature and the application of the guidance, for the LMDCs and ARAB GROUP, this meant it was premature to produce text. The EU, SWITZERLAND, the US, AUSTRALIA, and CANADA suggested an informal note could capture the varied views.

Parties could not agree on a mandate to produce a text.

Emissions from fuel used for international aviation and maritime transport: During the SBSTA informal consultations, Co-Facilitators Jakob Wiesbauer-Lenz (EU) and Pacifica Achieng Ogola (Kenya) introduced draft Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA) conclusions. Parties could not agree to paragraphs that: acknowledge the presence of International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) and International Maritime Organization (IMO) representatives at the session; request these bodies to assess the impacts of their proposed goals on developing countries; and reference the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities. Parties agreed to procedural conclusions stating that SBSTA 61 considered this matter and SBSTA 62 will continue its consideration.

Matters relating to the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM): During informal consultations under the SBSTA, Co-Facilitators Karolina Anttonen (Finland) and Alick Muvundika (Zambia) introduced draft SBSTA conclusions and a draft decision by the COP serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP). They invited views on: timeframes for ceasing CDM activities; and transfer of funds from the CDM Trust Fund to the Adaptation Fund and anywhere else. The Secretariat provided responses to clarification questions raised by parties on Wednesday, on matters such as the projected year-end balance of the CDM Trust Fund and the number of CDM activities submitted for transition to the Article 6.4 mechanism.

Most parties, including AOSIS, the EU, AILAC, and others, supported setting the earliest date possible for ceasing CDM activities and suggested deleting references to "or any other later date." The LMDCs, the ARAB GROUP, and BRAZIL preferred

to continue consideration of the matter at CMP 20. BRAZIL also called for deleting the draft CMP decision.

Different views were expressed regarding the destination for the fund transfer, with most parties supporting transfer to the Adaptation Fund, and several parties additionally calling to use funds for capacity building and for developing the Article 6 architecture.

The Co-Facilitators will revise the draft text.

Adaptation

Report of the Adaptation Committee: SB informal consultations co-facilitated by Geert Fremout (Belgium) once again stalled, with parties debating the process for moving forward. The EU, the EIG, AILAC, AOSIS, AUSTRALIA, the US, and CANADA lamented that the Co-Facilitators' draft text was circulated only minutes before the session, and called for a brief suspension for parties to review it before engaging in substantive discussions thereon. The AFRICAN GROUP opposed, saying that the Co-Facilitators had not been given any mandate to produce text in the first place, and expressed disappointment that no bilateral consultations had been conducted. Disagreements continued after the Secretariat's legal service clarified that Co-Facilitators can produce text under their own authority, but that it is up to countries whether to engage on it.

The Co-Facilitators will consult with the SB Chairs.

Review of the progress, effectiveness, and performance of the Adaptation Committee: In SB informal consultations co-facilitated by Lina Yassin (Sudan) parties disagreed on whether a conference room paper submitted by the AFRICAN GROUP, ARAB GROUP, and LMDCs could serve as a basis for draft text. AUSTRALIA objected, requesting written advice from the Secretariat on the legal status of conference room papers. Supporting AUSTRALIA on its procedural position, the EU also noted it is not up to constituted bodies to determine review modalities to be followed by the CMA.

In view of lack of time for further discussion, parties converged on adopting procedural conclusions capturing the status of work and inviting submissions as input for further consideration of the matter at SB 62.

National Adaptation Plans (NAPs): In SBI informal consultations, Co-Facilitator Antwi-Boasiako Amoah (Ghana) noted that the last session ended in a stalemate, while SBI Chair Nabeel Munir urged delegates to reach agreement on this crucial item. After a huddle, the G-77/CHINA agreed to mandating the Co-Facilitators to produce a draft decision based on the informal note, requesting: explicit references to developed countries' obligations to provide means of implementation for the formulation and implementation of NAPs; acknowledgement of the significant gap in adaptation finance; and no references to the role of the private sector as a provider of adaptation finance. JAPAN and NEW ZEALAND, among others, said that the draft text should not only reflect the informal note, but also views expressed in the room. They further highlighted that adaptation finance is already being discussed under other agenda items and should not be referenced in the NAP decision.

The Co-Facilitators will produce draft text.

Loss and Damage

Joint annual report of the Executive Committee of the Warsaw International Mechanism for Loss and Damage associated with Climate Change Impacts and the Santiago Network: During the SB informal consultations, Co-Facilitator Farhan Akhtar (US) introduced an informal note that captures parties' suggestions for potential topics to be discussed, noting it is not negotiating text. The G-77/CHINA, EU, and US supported giving the Co-Facilitators the mandate to prepare draft text on specific issues, such as complementarity among the bodies dealing with loss and damage, and accessibility and outreach. They suggested discussing the rest of the issues in informal consultations. YOUTH NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS urged improving the inclusion of children, and young experts and groups in the relevant platforms, such as through provision of resources and engagement in the knowledge-sharing platforms.

Discussions will continue in informal informals.

Other Issues

Poznan strategic programme on technology transfer: In SBI informal consultations, Co-Facilitators Duduzile Nhlegenthwa-Masina (Eswatini) and Stig Svenningsen (Norway) introduced an informal note outlining the options to: conclude consideration of the strategic programme; consider concluding it once the technology implementation programme is operationalized; or request the GEF to develop a new phase of the strategic programme focused on enabling implementation of the outcomes of the technology needs assessments.

The G-77/CHINA opposed concluding the programme at this time, with the LDCs and AFRICAN GROUP expressing preference for a new phase. BRAZIL, JAPAN, AUSTRALIA and CANADA cautioned against a potential duplication of work. Many developed countries emphasized the decision-making authority of the GEF Council.

Discussions continued in informal informals.

Just Transition Work Programme: In an SB contact group, Co-Chair Kishan Kumarsingh (Trinidad and Tobago) invited views on an informal note. AUSTRALIA highlighted the need to meaningfully incorporate human rights references, including rights of women and girls. The UK and US both stressed the importance of reflecting the link between just transition and the 1.5°C goal, and emphasized mitigation ambition, including through GST implementation. The US objected to a preambular paragraph referencing paragraph 154 of decision 1/CMA.5 (GST 1) in the context of just transition, which relates to unilateral, trade-restrictive measures. On findings of the dialogues held under the work programme, the UK suggested recognizing:

- the socio-economic opportunity for transitioning away from fossil fuels;
- the importance of education and skills development and ensuring decent jobs and wages; and
- labor rights, including collective bargaining, and the role of cooperation among governments, businesses, and labor unions in ensuring just transition.

The G-77/CHINA raised a point of order, demanding that the contact group be suspended to allow for the group to coordinate their position.

Procedural and logistical elements of the overall GST process: In SBSTA informal consultations, co-facilitated by Thureya Al Ali (UAE) and Patrick Spicer (Canada), parties reacted to a streamlined informal note containing a bulleted list of decision text elements.

On cross-cutting issues, GRUPO SUR, the AFRICAN GROUP, and LMDCs called for referencing international cooperation, with GRUPO SUR and the LMDCs also calling for including the Convention's principles.

On thematic areas for the technical assessment, GRUPO SUR and GRENADA called for references to loss and damage, with GRENADA also calling for inclusion of just transition and the ocean. The LMDCs and the US referred to decision 19/CMA.1 (matters relating to the GST) as already defining the areas. The UK cautioned against restricting future GSTs from responding to emerging issues.

On the timeline for the technical assessment, GRUPO SUR stressed the need for a “proper political discussion” and allowing for overlap between the technical assessment and the political consideration thereof. GRENADA noted the practical aspects of this should be examined.

Gender: During the SBI informal consultations, Co-Facilitators Marc-André Lafrance (Canada) and Ruleta Thomas (Antigua and Barbuda) introduced new draft text and identified specific paragraphs in the draft, relating to finance, language, and terminology, for parties to further consult on.

In the afternoon, parties focused on paragraphs of a draft text on which consensus seemed more likely. On taking note of the gender composition report ([FCCC/CP/2024/4](#)), EGYPT called for deleting the reference to persistent lack of progress, which the EIG, the EU, and AOSIS opposed. In the preamble, EGYPT and INDONESIA requested bracketing references to “gender diversity” and replacing references to “Indigenous Peoples” with “Indigenous communities.”

Research and Systematic Observation: In SBSTA informal consultations, co-facilitated by Patricia Nyinguro (Kenya) and Frank McGovern (Ireland), parties reviewed an iteration of draft text paragraph by paragraph.

The LMDCs opposed language on the importance of observational data to the work of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) in providing the best available science, noting that the IPCC is not the only beneficiary of such data and is not the only source of best available science. Compromise was found by adding “including” before “to the work of IPCC,” and removing a reference to best available science.

Parties again debated a reference to 2024 being on track to become the warmest year on record and reflecting the long-term warming trend caused by historic and ongoing anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions. The LMDCs emphasized correctly capturing scientific findings and preventing “alarmist” interpretations by the public. Among others, the group called for referring to “cumulative emissions from pre-industrial times until now” as a cause of long-term warming.

Matters relating to Action for Climate Empowerment (ACE): SBI informal consultations were co-facilitated by Nathalie Flores González (Dominican Republic) and Arne Riedel (Germany). Parties reported back on informal informals held the previous evening, which resulted in agreement on several paragraphs. WOMEN AND GENDER congratulated parties on “the good vibes in the room” and allowing observers to attend the informal informals, advocating for expanding the practice to the entire UNFCCC process.

Building on the informal informal discussions, parties agreed to seven paragraphs related to, *inter alia*: past and future events, submissions, and reports; empowering all members of society to engage in climate action; and integrating ACE elements into policymaking.

On the focus of submissions for the midterm review of the ACE work programme, parties proposed three text options, emphasizing different aspects of ACE implementation and related support, including challenges, gaps, improvements, and other information deemed necessary. This paragraph and three remaining paragraphs will be discussed further in informal informals.

Administrative, financial, and institutional matters: In SBI informal consultations, co-facilitated by Lenneke Ijzendoorn (Netherlands), parties agreed on a draft COP decision and a draft CMP decision. In response to the recommendation by the UN Board of Auditors, the Secretariat highlighted that Heads of Delegation were invited to an in-person briefing on the proposed budget for the next biennium, to be held during the second week.

In the Corridors

Thursday was a day for huddles, not cuddles. Negotiations were tough almost everywhere, with suspensions aplenty to allow for coordination. The debate on the new finance goal moved into informal informals and group consultations, with some negotiators suggesting they likely would not “emerge” from these settings until the second week. An observer welcomed the move, since, as he put it “developed countries are happy to talk about human rights, but not the quantum, in front of us—assuming they will at all.”

Stalemates also affected adaptation negotiations, where parties repeatedly had to request legal advice on working procedures from the Secretariat. A passionate plea by SBI Chair Nabeel Munir seemed to have the intended effect. Countries finally agreed to consider new text on national adaptation plans to be drafted by the Co-Facilitators—though views on what exactly that text should include were still diametrically opposed.

While many repeated that the GST dialogue should not be “a stocktake of a stocktake between two stocktakes,” some meant a lean series of events and others wished to narrow the dialogue’s scope. Perhaps because of these impasses, whispers encouraging a cover decision started to pass around the venue. Cover decisions are open fields, unrestricted by mandates and “a tempting place” for re-planting issues that seem stunted and hoping for growth.

**Follow daily coverage and photos of the
UN Climate Change Conference Baku
UNFCCC COP 29**



enb.iisd.org



subscribe at bit.ly/enbupdate



[@IISD_ENB](https://twitter.com/IISD_ENB)



facebook.com/IISD.ENB



Baku Climate Change Conference Friday, 15 November 2024

As usual for the day before the closing of the Subsidiary Bodies (SBs) to the UN Framework Convention on Climate (UNFCCC), parties were frantically trying to make progress, especially on the issues that will not be considered in the second week. Parties called the SB Chairs to the rescue on several matters.

Finance

New collective quantified goal: In informal consultations, Co-Facilitator Fiona Gilbert (Australia) introduced the revised text, noting that the Co-Facilitators had taken parties' suggestions to merge their own options and "did their best" to streamline the text on transparency, access, and rights-based language. Reporting back from informal informals, the room heard that one option related to transparency could potentially be deleted and another two could be merged.

The Co-Facilitators told parties to provide an update by 7:00 am on Saturday morning.

Standing Committee on Finance (SCF): In the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI) informal consultations on the second review of the SCF, Co-Facilitator Ali Waqas (Pakistan) reported that there was a reluctance to engage on substance until there is clarity on whether there will be one decision, under the COP, or two decisions, under the COP and CMA. He proposed that, based on consultations with the SBI Chair, parties continue their consideration of this matter at SBI 63 in November 2025. Parties agreed.

Arrangements between the COP, CMA, and the Board of the Loss and Damage Fund: In the informal consultations under the COP and CMA, co-facilitated by José Delgado (Austria), parties agreed to forward the draft COP and CMA decisions to their respective bodies, with minor amendments.

Dialogue on implementing the Global Stocktake outcomes, referred to in paragraph 97 of decision 1/CMA.5: In the SBI informal consultations, Co-Facilitator Ricardo Marshall (Barbados) asked parties if the revised informal note could be sent to the CMA for discussion next week.

The EU, the LEAST DEVELOPED COUNTRIES (LDCs), the US, and CANADA considered the text a good basis for further discussions. The RUSSIAN FEDERATION said they could not approve the text to go forward without an option to consider the Global Stocktake (GST) reference to unilateral trade measures. The LIKE-MINDED DEVELOPING COUNTRIES (LMDCs) underlined the text must include, among others, the GST references to the new collective quantified goal on climate finance (NCQG) and doubling adaptation finance, and that the GST will be implemented through various processes, including nationally

determined contributions (NDCs) and National Adaptation Plans (NAPs).

The AFRICAN GROUP, the LMDCs, NORWAY, and the US called for further discussion on modalities or draft conclusions this week. Many observed that several modality discussions are tied to scope, particularly on inputs, outputs, and high-level dialogues.

On scope, the AFRICAN GROUP reported constructive discussions in Presidency consultations and suggested removing scope from the informal note while those discussions continue. The EU, INDEPENDENT ALLIANCE OF LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN (AILAC), ALLIANCE OF SMALL ISLAND STATES (AOSIS), and others reiterated their preferred options. BRAZIL requested re-adding its option that the scope would be finance for the implementation of NDCs, NAPs, and agreed climate goals. The ENVIRONMENTAL INTEGRITY GROUP (EIG) observed the current three options are somewhat weighted toward a finance-only scope.

The EU, opposed by CHINA, requested the Secretariat to undertake a mapping exercise to plot GST outcomes against bodies' and work programmes' existing mandates. ENVIRONMENTAL NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS (ENGOs) called for a fair and feminist phase-out of fossil fuels and observed the lack of trust and need for accountability to track finance.

The Co-Facilitators assured that the informal note did not represent consensus and requested parties to provide "surgical edits" in writing.

Mitigation

Mitigation Ambition and Implementation Work

Programme (MWP): During the SB informal consultations, Co-Facilitators Ursula Fuentes (Germany) and Maesela John Kekana (South Africa) introduced an informal note for parties' consideration.

The LMDCs, the ARAB GROUP, and the RUSSIAN FEDERATION rejected it as a basis for discussions, noting it attempts to rewrite the group's mandate and, instead, focuses on GST follow up. The AFRICAN GROUP and INDIA also noted the text exceeds the group's mandate. Other parties, while noting they have not had sufficient time to consider the document, expressed willingness to engage with it as it captures all views.

The Co-Facilitators urged parties to continue to review the note and engage with one another. They will consult with the SB Chairs and request an additional time slot for discussions on Saturday.

Rules, Modalities, and Procedures for the Mechanism established by Paris Agreement Article 6.4: During the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA) informal consultations, Co-Facilitators Kate Hancock (Australia) and Sonam Tashi (Bhutan) invited parties to provide bridging

proposals based on the current draft text so as to allow for streamlining.

Parties provided their input, mainly reiterating their preferred options on the timing and content of authorizations, as well as changes and process of changes to authorizations. The EIG made suggestions for combining text on timing and statement of authorizations. TUVALU noted parties still have diverging views on most issues and called for further discussions before mandating the Co-Facilitators to provide clean text.

The Co-Facilitators will consult the SBSTA Chair on the way forward.

Matters relating to the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM): At the SBSTA informal consultations, Co-Facilitators Karolina Anttonen (Finland) and Alick Muvundika (Zambia) introduced a new iteration of the draft SBSTA conclusions and an annexed draft decision for the Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP).

Discussing the draft CMP decision, the UK questioned some parties' opposition to transferring funds from the CDM Trust Fund to the Adaptation Fund, clarifying that the investigation by auditors of the previous transfer authorized by CMP 16 related to the manner of transfer, not to its legality. The LMDCs explained the text links transfer of funds to the Adaptation Fund and to Article 6, which they cannot support, and, opposed by the EIG, expressed willingness to consider transfer to the Adaptation Fund only.

The draft SBSTA conclusions contain two options: to forward the draft decision to CMP 19 for consideration and adoption; or to continue consideration at SBSTA 63, with no mention of the annexed draft decision. The EU, the AFRICAN GROUP, the UK, and NORWAY supported the first option, while the LMDCs and BRAZIL preferred option two. The Co-Facilitators proposed a third option to continue consideration at SBSTA 63, with a reference to the annexed draft decision text, which no party supported. The EU and NORWAY suggested forwarding the draft text to the SBSTA Chair and Presidency.

The Co-Facilitators will consult with the SBSTA Chair on the way forward.

Adaptation

Matters relating to the Global Goal on Adaptation (GGA): In SB informal consultations co-facilitated by Tina Kobilšek (Slovenia), parties considered a draft text comprising 70 paragraphs with various options, tabling proposals for further amendments and streamlining.

On the process for defining adaptation indicators, debates revolved around: whether further guidance to the expert group was necessary; whether to settle on a specific number of indicators; the (dis-)aggregability of indicators; and whether to define indicators for tracking the provision of means of implementation for adaptation. TÜRKIYE proposed the inclusion of an indicator specific to children. BHUTAN and KYRGYZSTAN supported a mountain-specific indicator. The EIG called for ensuring gender balance among the technical experts.

On paragraph 38 of decision 2/CMA.5 (requesting the SBs to consider the GGA), countries discussed: the role of the IPCC and of Indigenous worldviews in enhancing understanding of climate risks; the inclusion of a standalone item on paragraph 38 in future sessions; and the timing of the GGA Framework's review in relation to GST 2.

Parties opposed any reference to the notion of "transformational adaptation," underscoring lack of time to consider the Secretariat's report on its definition ([FCCC/TP/2024/8](#)).

The Co-Facilitators will revise the text.

Report of the Adaptation Committee: In SB informal consultations, Co-Facilitator Lina Yassin (Sudan) invited views on

a revised informal note. The AFRICAN GROUP refused to engage with or hear any substantive interventions on the note and tabled an alternative conference room paper. Noting significant overlap between the informal note and the conference room paper, various delegates urged the Co-Facilitators to merge the two documents. The AFRICAN GROUP objected, saying that the informal note did not have the same status as the conference room paper.

In view of the stalemate, the Co-Facilitators proposed to simply welcome the Committees' 2024 report, which parties supported, although many expressed disappointment over the "minimal" outcome.

Review of the progress, effectiveness, and performance of the Adaptation Committee: In SB informal consultations co-facilitated by Geert Fremout (Belgium), parties conceded no agreement would be reached at this session. CANADA and AUSTRALIA urged inviting submissions before the next session. The AFRICAN GROUP opposed. Parties resorted to procedural conclusions, pushing further consideration of the matter to SB 62. The EU and NORWAY, among others, voiced their deep disappointment over stalled progress. The US said parties "should be ashamed" to once again delay work on the Committee, which is crucial to support responses to worsening climate risks.

National Adaptation Plans: In SBI informal consultations, Co-Facilitator Meredith Ryder-Rude (US) invited views on a streamlined text. The session was briefly suspended for groups to coordinate. When consultations resumed, the G-77/CHINA rejected the text, considering it unbalanced. The group lamented, among others, the lack of language on developed countries' obligations to provide means of implementation, and objected to references to the private sector in the provision of resources for NAP formulation and implementation. The EU, US, and AUSTRALIA requested including language on mainstreaming adaptation.

The Co-Facilitators will prepare a new text with options.

Matters related to LDCs: In SBI informal consultations, Co-Facilitator Ephraim Shitima (Zambia) invited views on the revised draft text. SAUDI ARABIA asked to bracket the entire text, every paragraph of the draft CMA decision, and the reference to the CMA decision in the SBI conclusions before engaging in any substantive discussion, while the SBI Chair conducts high-level consultation on the governance issue. AUSTRALIA noted there is a clear mandate from the CMA for the LDC Expert Group (LEG) to support the implementation of the GGA Framework and GST.

After lengthy debates on the process, parties began to engage on the text. In the draft COP decision text, the US suggested replacing a paragraph recognizing the specific needs and special situation of LDCs under Convention Article 4.9 with a reference to "recognizing Article 4.9, of the Convention and the preamble to the Paris Agreement on parties to it taking full account of the specific needs and special situations of the LDCs in their actions with regard to funding and transfer of technology," which Co-Facilitator Shitima identified as language from decision 15/CP.26 (extension of the LEG's mandate).

The US also suggested noting the challenges LDCs face in developing proposals for financial support for implementing NAPs. On a paragraph welcoming the role of stakeholders, INDIA called for referring to Indigenous Peoples "and local communities."

Discussions will continue in informal informals.

Other Issues

Joint annual report of the Executive Committee of the Warsaw International Mechanism for Loss and Damage associated with Climate Change Impacts and the Santiago network: In SB informal consultations, Co-Facilitator Pasha Carruthers (Cook Islands) invited views on the new draft text.

Noting the text had just been published, parties emphasized the need to coordinate first. Discussions will continue in informal informals.

Linkages between the Technology Mechanism and the Financial Mechanism: In the SBI informal consultations co-facilitated by Stephen Minas (Greece), parties debated a draft COP decision text and suggested amending, consolidating, bracketing, or deleting various paragraphs. Noting that such information and data were already available elsewhere, NORWAY and the US opposed requesting the Secretariat to prepare a technical report with consolidated information and data on linkages between the Technology Mechanism and the Financial Mechanism, including on the support provided by the Global Environment Facility and the Green Climate Fund for implementing outcomes of technology needs assessments. The G-77/CHINA insisted that the request be retained.

Parties agreed to continue consideration of the matter at SBI 62.

Poznan strategic programme on technology transfer: In SBI informal consultations co-facilitated by Duduzile Nhlengethwa-Masina (Eswatini) and Stig Svenningsen (Norway), parties continued to debate the implications of potentially concluding consideration of the matter and what this would imply for the strategic programme itself. The AFRICAN GROUP cautioned against losing the “procedural home” for considering the reports from the two last regional centers, of which one is in Africa.

Noting lack of agreement, the Co-Facilitators will submit the still extensively bracketed text to the SB Chairs, who will seek the Presidency’s guidance on the way forward.

Matters relating to Capacity Building: The SBI informal consultations were co-facilitated by Cristina Carreiras (EU) and Natalie Flores González (Dominican Republic). Noting agreement on the draft COP decision was reached the previous day, they invited views on a revised draft CMA decision.

The G-77/CHINA urged inserting in the chapeau language from decision 1/CMA.5 (GST outcome), specifically paragraphs 114 (recognition of capacity gaps and the urgent need to address them) and 120 (enhanced support for capacity building from the operating entities of the Financial Mechanism and the Adaptation Fund). The EU, the US, and JAPAN did not see merit in singling out these specific paragraphs.

After extensive deliberations, parties agreed to a bridging proposal by NORWAY to instead add an operative paragraph inviting the Paris Committee on Capacity-building to include in its annual report information on its integration of the GST outcomes, in particular paragraphs 111-120, which all pertain to capacity building.

With this, parties agreed to the draft CMA decision.

Procedural and logistical elements of the overall Global Stocktake process: Co-Facilitators Thureya Al Ali (UAE) and Patrick Spicer (Canada) opened the SB informal consultations and introduced a draft CMA decision text that seeks to capture the convergence of views.

Parties then provided initial reflections, noting they have not had sufficient time to consider the text and underlining that some of the unbracketed portions do not reflect consensus. The LMDCs opposed “cherry-picking” sources of input for the second GST and called for reference to a balance between Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and non-IPCC sources, which the EIG opposed. AILAC, the LDCs, the EU, the EIG, SOUTH AFRICA, AUSTRALIA, BRAZIL, and several others supported inviting the IPCC to align the publication of its reports with the GST timeline. EGYPT cautioned against compromising the IPCC’s credibility, noting an alignment request may affect the quality of the science.

The EU and AUSTRALIA called for deleting a bracketed paragraph that calls for shortening the technical phase of the GST. AOSIS, supported by the AFRICAN GROUP, called for stronger reference to provision of support for developing country participation, with the AFRICAN GROUP emphasizing the participation of developing country experts in future GST processes.

Views remained divergent on the need for a follow-up to the GST outcome, as well as the composition of the high-level committee for considering GST outputs. The EIG called for high-level ministerial engagement related to implementing the GST outcome and NDC preparation.

The Co-Facilitators will provide another iteration of text and encouraged informal discussions.

Research and Systematic Observation: In SBSTA informal consultations, co-facilitated by Patricia Nyinguro (Kenya) and Frank McGovern (Ireland), parties continued debating draft text, introducing brackets in various places. The LMDCs and ARAB GROUP opposed welcoming agreement on the outline of the IPCC’s upcoming reports on short-lived climate forcers and on cities, noting they do not contain scientific data. The EU, MADAGASCAR, BELIZE, BANGLADESH, and many others supported retaining the reference. Views also remained divergent on reference to “historic,” “ongoing,” or “cumulative” emissions in relation to temperature records.

Reporting tools under the Enhanced Transparency Framework: In SBSTA informal consultations, Co-Facilitator Daniela Romano (Italy) invited views on draft conclusions text. Parties agreed to add requests for the Secretariat to: maintain the interoperability of the tools with the IPCC software in cooperation with the IPCC; further enhance the tools and incorporate the actions referenced in its presentation during the relevant mandated event at SBSTA 61; and organize a mandated event at SBSTA 62 to inform parties about these updates.

With this, parties agreed on the draft conclusions.

In the Corridors

Depending on what issue they focus on, delegates had very different perspectives of the day’s discussions. Some were ready to wave goodbye to issues that ran their course. “Kill it already,” pleaded a seasoned delegate coming out of the talks on the Kyoto Protocol’s Clean Development Mechanism. Another delegate shared the same sentiment with regard to the Poznan programme on technology transfer.

On the other hand, the Subsidiary Body Chairs were in high demand to provide first aid on several adaptation items. It seems that help is too late for the Adaptation Committee, which will have to wait another six months to see discussions resume. But many hoped that least developed countries would not fall victim to debates over the respective role of the governing bodies of the Convention and Paris Agreement. “I cannot believe they would take those most in need of support hostage like this,” said an observer, exasperated by the escalation of debates over the respective authority of the COP and the CMA.

On finance, observers congregated around the CCTV screens, as meetings disappeared then reappeared. Those who stayed on until the evening were not much wiser, for parties reported potential agreement to delete one option and merge two others. The Co-Facilitators’ new text is more streamlined, but still leaves the big questions—quantum, contributor base, and eligibility—untouched. Negotiators have just this night before they too might have to say goodbye to their text as it moves into the Presidency’s hands. After the Subsidiary Bodies’ closing plenaries, we’ll learn of this and other issues’ fate in the expected Presidency stocktake session.

**Follow daily coverage and photos of the
UN Climate Change Conference Baku
UNFCCC COP 29**



enb.iisd.org



subscribe at bit.ly/enbupdate



[@IISD_ENB](https://twitter.com/IISD_ENB)



facebook.com/IISD.ENB



Baku Climate Change Conference: Saturday, 16 November 2024

The closing of the Subsidiary Bodies (SBs) to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) painted a bleak picture: further consideration of several issues, including on adaptation, loss and damage, and technology, were pushed to the SB's next session in June 2025. On the mitigation work programme and the just transition work programme, parties could not even agree to capture discussions held during the first week.

Finance

New collective quantified goal (NCQG): In the CMA contact group, co-chaired by Zaheer Fakir (UAE), parties pointed to constructive discussions on access in informal consultations the previous evening and in the morning, and requested more time for continued engagement in this format. All agreed to continue discussing access, with the AFRICAN GROUP and the INDEPENDENT ALLIANCE OF LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN (AILAC) suggesting progress could also be made on transparency and barriers.

The ARAB GROUP and LIKE-MINDED DEVELOPING COUNTRIES (LMDCs) noted they had submitted a streamlined joint proposal, which fed into the Co-Chairs' streamlined, 25-page text, but that some of their paragraphs were missing. CANADA recalled the understanding that no new elements would be introduced, noting they had refrained from proposing text on Indigenous Peoples' free, prior, and informed consent. The Co-Chairs confirmed they will not add new elements but will check for omissions.

The ENVIRONMENTAL INTEGRITY GROUP (EIG) and AUSTRALIA called for ensuring time to discuss other finance items too, especially the doubling of adaptation finance and the alignment of finance flows (Paris Agreement Article 2.1c).

Discussions continued in informal informals. In the afternoon, contact group Co-Chair Fakir indicated that the Co-Chairs would transmit the second iteration of draft text, corrected for some inaccuracies but with no new elements, to the Presidency and inform the Presidency about the outcome of parties' discussions in informal informals, noting their outcome has no status. Parties extensively praised the Co-Chairs' and the Secretariat's work, saying they did "a phenomenal job."

Second review of the Standing Committee on Finance (SCF): The Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI) agreed to continue consideration of this matter at SBI 63.

Dialogue on implementing the Global Stocktake (GST) outcomes, referred to in paragraph 97 of decision 1/CMA.5: In the SBI informal consultations, Co-Facilitators Ricardo Marshall (Barbados) and Patrick Spicer (Canada) drew attention to the revised informal note, particularly the paragraph that explains the note has not been agreed upon, does not reflect consensus, is not exhaustive, has no formal status, and is open to revision. They recalled that the SB Chairs have advised that there will not be written conclusions for procedural matters, including forwarding texts to the governing bodies. They asked if parties could agree to forward this text on these understandings.

The LMDCs, the ARAB GROUP, the AFRICAN GROUP, ALLIANCE OF SMALL ISLAND STATES (AOSIS), the LEAST DEVELOPED COUNTRIES (LDCs), the EIG, and the US said the text was a good basis for discussions next week.

The EU expressed reluctance to forward the text without adding references to GST outcomes related to adaptation and loss and damage to its preferred option, which is a broad scope to consider outcomes that do not fall under constituted bodies' and work programmes' existing mandates. AUSTRALIA agreed with these inclusions, observing a "misconception" that this option is mitigation-centric.

AILAC said its preferred scope option on including all GST outcomes, with particular focus on means of implementation, should focus on the provision of finance and other means of implementation. The EIG noted that this would exclude the action of countries that do not depend on means of implementation, which is critical for keeping 1.5°C alive.

The LMDCs emphasized linking the NCQG and this dialogue. Conversely, the EIG noted that the implementation of the GST, including its mitigation and adaptation outcomes, should be ingrained in the NCQG.

With further assurances from the Co-Facilitators that the SBI Chair would clarify in plenary that the text is open to revision, the EU agreed it could be forwarded to the Conference of the Parties (COP) serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement (CMA).

In its closing plenary, the SBs agreed to forward this matter for further consideration by CMA 6 on the basis of the informal

note prepared at SB 61. The EU lamented that more progress had not been made on this issue and called for follow up on all GST elements, while expressing flexibility about where this takes place. AOSIS expressed surprise and disappointment at the discussions so far, and stressed COP 29 cannot be considered a success without further progress on the GST outcome.

Mitigation

Mitigation Ambition and Implementation Work

Programme (MWP): When this item was taken up in the closing plenary, the SBI Chair noted lack of consensus on the way forward and indicated that, in accordance with Rules 10(c) and 16 of the draft rules of procedure, the matter will be included on the SB 62 agendas.

The UK, supported by the EU, AOSIS, AILAC, the LDCs, and the EIG, among others, emphasized the importance of progress on the MWP and proposed adopting procedural conclusions that would forward the item to CMA 6, capturing discussions held at SB 61. CHILE stressed this was the only work programme addressing the long-term goals of the Paris Agreement and urged parties to overcome the atmosphere of mistrust. LDCs underscored the “real and devastating consequences” of overshooting the 1.5°C target, including “loss of lives and the destruction of livelihoods.”

The AFRICAN GROUP, LMDCs, and ARAB GROUP objected to the proposed procedural conclusions, accusing developed countries of attempting to expand the mandate of the MWP and to impose a “prescriptive, top-down” approach to mitigation.

The SBs agreed that, in accordance with Rules 10(c) and 16 of the draft rules of procedure, the matter will be included on the SB 62 agendas.

Guidance on Cooperative Approaches referred to in Paris Agreement Article 6.2: The Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA) adopted conclusions ([FCCC/SBSTA/2024/L.14](#)), recommending to the CMA to consider the draft text prepared at SBSTA 61.

Rules, Modalities, and Procedures for the Mechanism established by Paris Agreement Article 6.4: During the SBSTA informal consultations, Co-Facilitator Kate Hancock (Australia) introduced the SBSTA Chair’s proposed draft CMA decision text. She proposed that parties adopt SBSTA conclusions to forward the draft CMA decision text to the CMA for further discussions during the second week, similar to what was agreed in the Article 6.2 informal consultations.

Most parties agreed to proceed in this manner, noting that the draft decision text does not represent consensus and contains several elements that parties have not yet discussed, such as the mechanism registry. The LMDCs noted the text had just been published and requested further time to coordinate.

In its closing plenary, the SBSTA adopted conclusions ([FCCC/SBSTA/2024/L.16](#)), recommending to the CMA to consider the draft text prepared at SBSTA 61.

Work Programme under the Framework for Non-market Approaches referred to in Paris Agreement Article 6.8: The SBSTA adopted conclusions ([FCCC/SBSTA/2024/L.15](#)) and recommended a draft decision for adoption by CMA 6 ([FCCC/SBSTA/2024/L.15/Add.1](#)).

Further guidance on features of nationally determined contribution (NDCs): In CMA informal consultations, Co-

Facilitators Sin Liang Cheah (Singapore) and Federica Fricano (Italy) observed three options: to conclude consideration of this matter, to defer consideration, or to proceed in informal informal consultations.

AOSIS, SWITZERLAND, COLOMBIA, the US, AUSTRALIA, the UK, and JAPAN called for further informal informal consultations and asked the Co-Facilitators to provide a “tool” to help guide discussions. INDIA and INDONESIA preferred deferring this decision.

The LMDCs and RUSSIAN FEDERATION emphasized that NDC features are defined in the Paris Agreement alone, particularly its provisions related to means of implementation. SAUDI ARABIA agreed further features are not needed, but noted there should be a common definition of climate finance. CHILE considered that the guidance adopted in 2018 provides the clarity, transparency, and understanding of NDCs, and said that raising ambition is about implementation, not additional features. The EIG disagreed, saying additional features could help fill the ambition gap.

AOSIS identified potential additional features, including that NDCs should be in line with best-available science, and informed by the GST, particularly related to energy transition. The EU suggested improving the inclusivity of NDC formulation, including in terms of gender-responsiveness.

After some discussion, parties agreed to task the Co-Facilitators with preparing a compilation of their views, as provided in writing, including their views on the way forward, for discussion during the second week.

Emissions from fuel used for international aviation and maritime transport: The SBSTA agreed to continue consideration of this matter at SBSTA 62 (June 2025).

Matters relating to the Clean Development Mechanism: The SBSTA agreed to continue consideration of this matter at SBSTA 62 (June 2025).

Adaptation

Matters relating to the Global Goal on Adaptation: In the SB informal consultations, Co-Facilitator Lamin Dibba (The Gambia) invited views on a new iteration of draft text, highlighting it was significantly streamlined and retained options for various paragraphs.

The SBs adopted conclusions ([FCCC/SB/2024/L.12](#)), in which they agreed to forward this matter to CMA 6 for further consideration on the basis of the draft text prepared at SB 61.

Report of the Adaptation Committee: The SBs adopted conclusions ([FCCC/SB/2024/L.9](#)), recommending that COP 29 and CMA 6 welcome the 2023 and 2024 reports of the Adaptation Committee.

Review of the progress, effectiveness, and performance of the Adaptation Committee: The SBs agreed to continue consideration of this matter at SB 62 (June 2025). The EU expressed disappointment that, for the fourth year, parties were unable to make progress on the review.

National Adaptation Plans: These SBI informal consultations were co-facilitated by Antwi-Boasiako Amoah (Ghana) and Meredith Ryder-Rude (US). Following a brief huddle, the G-77/ CHINA agreed to work on the basis of the Co-Facilitators’ revised draft COP decision. Parties discussed the text paragraph by

paragraph, proposing various amendments. They made significant progress, including in informal informals held throughout the afternoon, but had not yet managed to reach consensus on all elements.

The Presidency signaled it does not intend to take this matter up during the second week. As this is an SBI-only matter, this would push further consideration to SBI 62. Various groups expressed strong disappointment over the Presidency's stance, underscoring the constructive atmosphere in the room and that agreement was in sight.

In its closing plenary, the SBI adopted conclusions ([FCCC/SBI/2024/L.18](#)) forwarding this matter to COP 29 for further consideration on the basis of the draft text prepared at SBI 61.

Matters related to LDCs: In informal SBI consultations co-facilitated by Rik den Hoedt (Netherlands) and Ephraim Shitima (Zambia), the LDCs reported on an agreement reached during informal informals the night before. She proposed that the modalities of the LDCs Expert Group (LEG) review be considered at SBI 63, with the review to be conducted "jointly" by the COP and CMA, and a decision to this effect be taken by both COP 30 and CMA 7. Parties disagreed whether "jointly" was the correct term to use. SAUDI ARABIA proposed to use "in parallel with," while the LDCs favored "together with."

Parties then considered the draft decision paragraph by paragraph. SAUDI ARABIA, supported by the LMDCs, requested including a paragraph that recognizes that LDCs' response to the call in paragraph 59 of [decision 1/CMA.5](#) (calling on parties to have NAPs in place by 2025 and have progressed in their implementation by 2030) depends on developed countries meeting their obligations under the Convention and the Paris Agreement. The EU, the US, and AUSTRALIA opposed this. SAUDI ARABIA further proposed requesting developed countries to provide finance, technology, and capacity-building support to LDCs. Parties eventually converged on the COP conducting the LEG review "in parallel with" CMA, but did not agree to SAUDI ARABIA's suggested additions.

The SBI adopted conclusions ([FCCC/SBI/2024/L.17](#)) and recommended a draft decision for adoption by COP 29 ([FCCC/SBI/2024/L.17/Add.1](#)).

Loss and Damage

2024 Review of the Warsaw International Mechanism for Loss and Damage (WIM): The SBs agreed that, in accordance with Rules 10(c) and 16 of the draft rules of procedure, the matter will be included on the SB 62 agendas.

Joint annual report of the Executive Committee and the Santiago Network: Farhan Akhtar (US) co-facilitated the joint consideration of the WIM review and the joint report of the WIM's Executive Committee and the Santiago Network. The G-77/CHINA reported back from informal informals the previous evening, noting that potential landing zones had been identified on issues such as: regional offices of the Santiago Network; coherence and complementarity among different bodies in the loss and damage landscape; enhanced finance; the WIM's Action and Support Expert Group; and the possibility of a state of loss and damage report. They pointed to differing views on the location of the Santiago Network and noted that no text had been agreed.

To capture progress made, the Co-Facilitators introduced an informal note with headings on areas where advances had occurred, as well as draft procedural conclusions forwarding both agenda items to the governing bodies for further consideration during the second week. The AFRICAN GROUP objected, noting that it preferred using an earlier informal note and that it would only forward the issue to governing bodies with clear guidance on a way forward.

In their closing plenary, the SBs agreed that, in accordance with Rules 10(c) and 16 of the draft rules of procedure, the matter will be included on the SB 62 agendas.

Reporting under the Convention, the Kyoto Protocol, and the Paris Agreement

Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Data Interface: The SBSTA adopted conclusions ([FCCC/SBSTA/2024/L.11](#)).

Annex-I reporting: Status of submission and review of national communications and biennial reports: The SBI took note of the information in the report ([FCCC/SBI/2024/INF.10](#)).

Compilations and syntheses of biennial reports: The SBI took note of the information in the report ([FCCC/SBI/2023/INF.7](#)) and agreed to continue consideration of this matter at SBI 62 (June 2025).

Report on national GHG inventory data: The SBI took note of the information in the reports ([FCCC/SBI/2023/15](#) and [FCCC/SBI/2024/17](#)), and agreed to continue consideration of this matter at SBI 62 (June 2025).

Annual reports on technical reviews: Technical review of information reported in biennial reports and national communications: The SBSTA took note of the information in the 2024 report ([FCCC/SBSTA/2024/INF.5](#)).

Technical review of GHG inventories: The SBSTA took note of the information in the 2024 report ([FCCC/SBSTA/2024/INF.2](#)).

Technical review of GHG inventories and other information reported: The SBSTA adopted conclusions ([FCCC/SBSTA/2024/L.10](#)).

Reporting from non-Annex I parties: Information contained in national communications: The SBI agreed to continue consideration of this matter at SBI 62 (June 2025).

Provision of financial and technical support for developing country reporting under the Convention: In accordance with Rules 10(c) and 16 of the draft rules of procedure, the matter will be included on the SBI 62 agenda.

Summary reports on the technical analysis of biennial update reports of non-Annex I parties: The SBI took note of the 180 technical analysis summary reports that were published by 3 September 2024.

Report of the Consultative Group of Experts: The SBI adopted conclusions ([FCCC/SBI/2024/L.16](#)).

Report of the administrator of the international transaction log under the Kyoto Protocol: The SBI recommended the Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP) to take note of the report for 2024 ([KP/CMP/2024/5](#)).

Reporting tools under the Enhanced Transparency Framework: The SBSTA adopted conclusions ([FCCC/SBSTA/2024/L.12](#)).

Provision of financial and technical support to developing countries for reporting under the Paris Agreement: In accordance with Rules 10(c) and 16 of the draft rules of procedure, the matter will be included on the SBI 62 agenda. The LDCs expressed disappointment over lack of support for developing countries, given the amount of resources needed to prepare Biennial Transparency Reports.

Other Issues

Just Transition Work Programme: In the SB contact group, Co-Chair Kishan Kumarsingh (Trinidad and Tobago) introduced a draft decision text prepared by the Co-Chairs to inform further discussions under the CMA. After a suspension for parties to consider the text, AOSIS, the EIG, the EU, GRUPO SUR, NEPAL, and others agreed to forward it, underscoring it would be a shame to lose progress made during the first week. With reassurances that there will be space to discuss further revisions, the AFRICAN GROUP also agreed to forward draft text.

The LMDCs, supported by OMAN and the RUSSIAN FEDERATION, rejected moving forward with the Co-Chairs' text, stating that it does not incorporate their views on many issues, including countries' right to nationally determine just transition pathways in line with their capacities, and read out their suggested text for the decision. SAUDI ARABIA lamented depleted carbon budgets for 2020-2030 in light of historic cumulative emissions as well as developed countries' insufficient mitigation efforts.

In the closing plenary, the SB Chairs noted the SBs could not conclude their consideration of the matter. The SBs agreed to forward this item to CMA 6 for further consideration.

Matters relating to the Forum on the Impact of the Implementation of Response Measures under the Convention, Kyoto Protocol, and Paris Agreement: The SBs agreed to forward the matter to COP 29, CMP 19, and CMA 6, taking into account the draft text prepared at SB 61, noting that the draft text being forwarded does not represent consensus among Parties.

Procedural and logistical elements of the overall GST process: The SBs agreed to forward this matter for further consideration by CMA 6 on the basis of the draft text prepared at SB 61.

Gender: In SBI informal consultations, Co-Facilitator Marc-André Lafrance (Canada) invited views on a revised draft COP decision. The EU, AILAC, MEXICO, BRAZIL, AUSTRALIA, and others underscored their concerns and objection to any backsliding from agreed language. CHINA emphasized the need for developed countries to provide support to developing countries for implementing gender-related measures. IRAN expressed concern over some elements in the text, noting they contradict the country's principles, values, and national legislation. SAUDI ARABIA noted the matter is both "significant and sensitive." YOUNGOs considered parts of the proposed text discriminatory. WOMEN AND GENDER lamented the bracketing of language on addressing violence against women.

The SBI agreed to forward this matter to the COP 29 for further consideration on the basis of the draft text prepared at SBI 61. The EU stressed the need to progress on climate action that is inclusive of women and girls in all their gender diversity and lamented attempts to backslide on agreed language.

Joint Work on Implementation of Climate Action on Agriculture and Food Security: The SBs adopted conclusions ([FCCC/SB/2024/L.8](#)).

Research and Systematic Observation: The SBSTA adopted conclusions ([FCCC/SBSTA/2024/L.17](#)).

Matters relating to Action for Climate Empowerment: The SBs adopted conclusions ([FCCC/SBI/2024/L.14](#)).

Administrative, financial, and institutional matters: The SBs recommended draft decisions for adoption by COP 29 ([FCCC/SBI/2024/L.11](#)) and CMP 19 ([FCCC/SBI/2024/L.10](#)).

Closure of the session: The SBI and SBSTA adopted their reports ([FCCC/SBI/2024/L.15](#) and [FCCC/SBSTA/2024/L.13](#)). The Secretariat advised of the budgetary implications of the decisions taken and urged parties to support the supplementary budget to ensure activities can be undertaken.

SBI Chair Nabeel Munir called on parties to cross their "arbitrary" red lines and find common ground during the remainder of the COP for a cooler, safer planet.

SBSTA Chair Harry Vreuls reminded parties that the SBSTA's achievements are their achievements and urged them to move forward with ambition, collaboration, and unwavering resolve.

Many parties and UNFCCC Executive Secretary Simon Stiell thanked the Chairs for their patient guidance and leadership over their terms. The SBs gaveled to a close at 12:23 am.

In the Corridors

The last day of the first conference week was a scurry. First, the unadvertised, but widely used, "grandreserva" schedule went down. "I cannot believe that today, of all days, we have to rely on the UNFCCC website," cursed a seasoned delegate as they scrolled through the shinier, but less functional public schedule, trying to spot ever-vanishing sessions.

Delegates were told in many of the lingering Subsidiary Body negotiations that they needed to wrap up. The Presidency drew some lines of what they would and would not take up in the second week. It issued what one delegate termed "a cease and desist order" in discussions on national adaptation plans, just as the room was making progress. But parties were not having it. In what some called a "collective mutiny" and others a "welcome manifestation of the negotiations' party-driven nature," they decided to forward it to the second week anyhow. An ecstatic diplomat was struggling to find the right words to describe what had happened: "This was one of the wildest multilateral negotiations I have experienced in my career."

A negotiator recognized that the Presidency is "perhaps being mindful of its capacity, considering how much we are kicking to the second week." Reaching agreement on the new finance goal will be a hefty political lift. So will settling debates over taking the outcomes of the first Global Stocktake forward. Each issue is contentious in its own right. Some of these texts are mere bullet point lists, others are replete with brackets. And some of these brackets are more sobering than others. "They bracketed a reference to addressing violence against women," fumed an outraged observer who hoped that a day of rest will help "bring people back to their senses." Without the promised Presidency stocktaking to outline how issues will move forward, delegates may instead spend their rest day preparing their ministers for the many scenarios that remain possible given the substantial work ahead.