

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

