

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.