

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 Nyunguro (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

