

Belém Climate Change Conference: Friday, 14 November 2025

Agreement was found on some issues, including matters relating to least developed countries (LDCs) and arrangements for intergovernmental meetings. Many other discussions remained inconclusive, with negotiations continuing into the night to make further progress ahead of the Subsidiary Bodies' closing plenary on Saturday.

Consultations by Presiding Officers

SB Chairs' consultations on Paris Agreement Article 9.1:

SBSTA Chair Adonia Ayebare (Uganda) and SBI Chair Julia Gardiner (Australia) recalled the [mandate](#) they received in the context of the adoption of the SB 62 agendas to hold substantive consultations on Article 9.1 and report back at SB 63 with a view for Parties to determine a way forward, including potentially a standalone item on this matter. They noted this report back was a repetition of the one provided during the SB 63 [opening plenary](#), as requested by some Parties.

The SB Chairs reported that during the consultations, Parties had proposed different options, including: a standalone agenda item or work programme on Article 9.1; an agenda item on Articles 9.1–9.3; an agenda item on Article 9.1 under the CMA and on UNFCCC Article 4.3 under the COP, to replace all existing finance agenda items except the guidance to the operating entities of the Financial Mechanism; and an SBI agenda item on matters relating to finance to inform discussions under the COP and CMA. Noting lack of consensus on the way forward, the SB Chairs stated that this report back concludes their mandate.

The LIKE-MINDED DEVELOPING COUNTRIES (LMDCs) and ARAB GROUP expressed concern over how the SB Chairs' consultations were conducted at SB 62. They noted that only one consultation was undertaken and that some, such as the LMDCs, were not allowed to complete their intervention during that single consultation. With SOUTH AFRICA and GHANA, they also expressed their disappointment at the lack of consensus to have a standalone agenda item on this matter.

CHINA noted no objections have been raised during this report back to having a standalone agenda item on this matter. CANADA queried the purpose of the meeting, highlighting their understanding that it was just to hear a report back. SBSTA Chair Ayebare stated that the SB Chairs have concluded their mandate and this issue is now being addressed through Presidency consultations.

Presidency consultations on NDCs, BTRs, Article 9.1, and UTMs: Túlio Andrade, COP 30/CMP 20/CMA 7 Presidency, invited Parties' views on the first of three broad themes to guide discussions: "united in celebration of the 10th-year anniversary of the Paris Agreement."

Most Parties supported acknowledging the achievements of the Paris Agreement and the importance of multilateralism. The ALLIANCE OF SMALL ISLAND STATES (AOSIS), AFRICAN GROUP, and others noted that expected warming by 2100 has dropped a full degree as a result of the Paris Agreement's implementation. The AFRICAN GROUP, ARAB GROUP, and CHINA called for also recognizing the importance and achievements of the UNFCCC and Kyoto Protocol. AOSIS and the LDCs called for welcoming the climate change-related advisory opinions issued by the [International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea](#), [International Court of Justice](#), and [Inter-American Court of Human Rights](#) over the last two years. The EIG suggested acknowledging the role of science and science-based action, and AUSTRALIA proposed recognizing record levels of renewable and clean energy investment.

Despite these achievements, Parties however noted that gaps remain. AOSIS emphasized that, because of insufficient short-term action since 2015, the goal of limiting warming to 1.5°C without some overshoot is becoming less likely. The AFRICAN GROUP highlighted the ambition and implementation gaps, noting the need for international cooperation and predictable finance to support developing countries' climate action. The LMDCs stressed the centrality of Article 9.1 and addressing unilateral trade measures (UTMs).

The ENVIRONMENTAL INTEGRITY GROUP (EIG) and JAPAN suggested encouraging Parties that have not done so to submit 1.5°C-aligned nationally determined contributions (NDCs). NORWAY proposed calling on all actors to strengthen climate action, support, and international cooperation. BANGLADESH urged moving away from unilateralism and protectionism towards international cooperation and multilateralism.

ENVIRONMENTAL NGOs said developed countries must stop blocking the creation of a political space to address the shortfalls on Article 9.1, stressing that "the longer you delay, the higher your bill is becoming." BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY NGOs emphasized public finance remains vital and called for a space to discuss UTMs.

LOCAL GOVERNMENTS AND MUNICIPAL AUTHORITIES urged Parties to "turbo charge subnational

implementation” in order to close the NDCs’ ambition gap. RESEARCH AND INDEPENDENT NGOs stressed climate action must be based on best available science and underscored the importance of knowledge sharing and including the voices of the research community in Paris Agreement implementation.

TRADE UNION NGOs lamented that billions outside the negotiating rooms cannot ignore the implementation gap and called for a just transition for workers and creation of decent work. WOMEN AND GENDER emphasized that, without climate finance, gender-responsive and transformative climate action would be impossible. YOUTH NGOs said developing countries must not be forced to choose between climate action and dealing with the crisis they did not create, underscoring that climate action in developing countries would be impossible without predictable finance.

Presidency consultations on mountains and climate change: Pedro Brancante, COP 30/CMP 20/CMA 7 Presidency, convened consultations, as agreed in the context of [adopting](#) the COP 30 agenda.

The MOUNTAIN GROUP, supported by NEPAL, BHUTAN, COLOMBIA, CHILE, and the RUSSIAN FEDERATION, proposed the establishment of an annual dialogue on mountains and climate change, building on the experience of the [expert dialogue](#) held at SB 60, to be similar in character to the annual Ocean and Climate Change Dialogue. The MOUNTAIN GROUP, supported by GEORGIA and NEPAL, but opposed by SWITZERLAND, JAPAN, and CHILE, also called for a dedicated mountain agenda item.

A youth representative lamented there has been no follow-up on the [expert dialogue](#) on children held at SB 60 and said “we cannot talk about mountains while forgetting children.”

Finance

Fund for responding to Loss and Damage: In COP/CMA informal consultations, Co-Facilitator Jose Delgado Jimenez (Austria) invited views on draft decision text, noting the draft COP and CMA decisions mirror each other, with the CMA decision containing an additional paragraph related to the new collective quantified goal on climate finance (NCQG).

AOSIS and the LDCs underscored the need to emphasize direct access and rapid disbursement. The EU and AUSTRALIA cautioned against singling out individual elements. The ARAB GROUP emphasized reflecting that all developing countries have direct access to resources from the Fund ([Decision 1/CP.28](#), paragraph 20e). CANADA called for specific reference to women, youth, and Indigenous Peoples in relation to observer engagement. JAPAN reiterated their proposal for a lessons-learned process on the Barbados Implementation Modalities to inform risk reduction.

Regarding the CMA decision, the GROUP OF 77 AND CHINA (G-77/CHINA) emphasized the need to include a specific reference to paragraph 16 of the [NCQG decision](#) (tripling of annual outflows of climate funds). The EIG, EU, UK CANADA, and AUSTRALIA emphasized the relevance of other elements of the decision, with CANADA and AUSTRALIA pointing to provisions on access. The AFRICAN GROUP suggested reference to “relevant paragraphs of the decision, in particular paragraph 16.”

Dialogue on finance flow alignment (Paris Agreement Article 2.1c): In CMA informal consultations, Co-Facilitator

Ralf Bodle (Germany) introduced an informal note which outlines elements for a draft decision and invited views on future engagement on Article 2.1c.

The EU called for future work on: exchanging experiences with domestic policies, in a non-prescriptive way; developments in other forums; transparency and tracking of progress, in a non-burdensome way; and positive and negative spillover effects of Article 2.1.c implementation.

The AFRICAN GROUP, ARAB GROUP, and AOSIS stated that high-level engagement is premature. The EU, CANADA, and others supported the development of non-prescriptive guidance to inform the work of finance actors. The EU suggested a dialogue among relevant institutions, noting this would complement work among parties. The UK and AUSTRALIA suggested a process for parties and non-party stakeholders to make voluntary submissions on actions relevant to the implementation of Article 2.1c.

The Co-Facilitators will prepare a draft decision.

Mitigation

Mitigation Work Programme (MWP): In SB informal consultations, Co-Facilitator Maesela John Kekana (South Africa) invited Parties’ views on forwarding the informal note for further consideration by the CMA in the second conference week.

AOSIS, the LDCs, EIG, and JAPAN urged referencing the 1.5°C goal explicitly. The ARAB GROUP, LMDCs, and RUSSIAN FEDERATION disagreed, with the ARAB GROUP stating that it is not scientifically appropriate to mention keeping 1.5°C within reach since it has already been exceeded.

AOSIS, BELIZE, and NEW ZEALAND underscored recognizing the importance of the role of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) in producing the best available science for effective climate action. The ARAB GROUP disagreed, stating that the MWP is not the place for this language and that this is being taken up in SBSTA negotiations on research and systematic observation.

PARAGUAY rejected text that links deforestation with agriculture. GUYANA, the EIG, and NEW ZEALAND stressed retaining this text, with the EIG highlighting that the first COP in the Amazon must produce a clear message on the importance of forests for enhancing climate resilience.

The AFRICAN GROUP, LDCs, and LMDCs expressed their support for the launch of a digital platform, while AOSIS, the INDEPENDENT ALLIANCE OF LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN (AILAC), JAPAN, BELIZE, NEW ZEALAND, and the RUSSIAN FEDERATION shared concerns, specifying they need more clarity on the function of the platform and how it will be governed.

AOSIS, the LDCs, JAPAN, AILAC, and NEW ZEALAND supported the option containing some steps that would inform Parties’ consideration of the continuation of the MWP with a view to adopting a decision at CMA 8. The LMDCs, AFRICAN GROUP, and ARAB GROUP preferred the no text option.

Parties converged on forwarding the note for further consideration under the CMA.

Paris Agreement Article 6.2 (bilateral cooperative approaches): During CMA informal consultations co-facilitated by Peer Stiansen (Norway) and Pacifica Achieng Ogola (Kenya), discussions focused on the Secretariat’s [report](#) on implementation of the Article 6.2 [guidance](#). TÜRKIYE, AILAC,

and the AFRICAN GROUP called for an update on progress in developing the international registry, with the AFRICAN GROUP highlighting that many countries intend to use it as their national registry.

The ARAB GROUP and RUSSIAN FEDERATION, opposed by AILAC and the EIG, called for deleting the reference to “carbon pricing” in the report. The RUSSIAN FEDERATION, CHINA, and the LDCs said it is premature to consider reviewing the Article 6.2 guidance, noting the need for more experience in the operation of Article 6.2.

The AFRICAN GROUP proposed requesting the Secretariat to prepare a technical note on the operating costs of the Article 6.2 architecture. The LDCs called for strengthened capacity-building. The EU urged that future reports should include more detailed and disaggregated data.

The Co-Facilitators invited submissions from Parties to inform the preparation of draft decision text.

Adaptation

Global Goal on Adaptation: In SB informal consultations, Co-Facilitator Tine Kobilšek (Slovenia) introduced a new iteration of draft text, noting the need to forward the text to the CMA through SB conclusions. Parties noted that some of their proposals were not adequately reflected, proposed further textual edits, and asked to bracket various paragraphs.

GRUPO SUR, with AILAC, urged adopting the list of indicators with a reference to data disaggregation. GRUPO SUR also: called for referencing transboundary and cascading climate risks; suggested reusing previous decision language that spells out cross-cutting considerations regarding the indicators, with AILAC urging reference to migrants; and proposed language on the role of the Green Climate Fund and the Adaptation Fund in providing support for reporting on the indicators.

The EU urged focusing on three areas requiring further reflection going forward: the substance of the indicators; work post-CMA 7; and who undertakes that work. The ARAB GROUP called the new text “a mixed bowl of different fruits” and lamented that many proposals had been merged that do not belong together, making concrete suggestions for bracketing and reorganising different elements of the text.

Observer constituencies supported reusing language from previous decisions in relation to cross-cutting considerations, and called for the tripling of adaptation finance to reach USD 120 billion by 2030.

National adaptation plans (NAPs): In SBI informal consultations facilitated by Antwi-Boasiako Amoah (Ghana) and Cassandra Moll (New Zealand), Parties proposed detailed textual edits to draft conclusions.

They disagreed on whether to delete several paragraphs referencing means of implementation for adaptation, with the ARAB GROUP wanting to retain specific paragraphs and CANADA urging their deletion.

The LMDCs and AFRICAN GROUP proposed deleting a paragraph on wider enabling conditions. AUSTRALIA, CANADA, and the EU opposed, saying that NAP implementation is not just about finance, while acknowledging that the paragraph could be further streamlined. The LDCs called for separating mobilization of and access to finance.

Parties also reformulated and removed brackets around a paragraph regarding platforms for information sharing, as well as on mainstreaming adaptation.

Discussions continued in the evening.

Matters related to LDCs: In SBI informal consultations, co-facilitated by Rik den Hoedt (the Netherlands), Parties continued discussing draft text.

In a paragraph on the LDC Expert Group’s support for addressing the specific needs of LDCs, the ARAB GROUP, supported by the LMDCs, requested reaffirming the principles of the UNFCCC and its Paris Agreement, including the principles of equity and common but differentiated responsibilities in light of different national circumstances. The EU, LDCs, JAPAN, and NORWAY noted that the proposed addition was out of context.

The ARAB GROUP, opposed by the LDCs, EU, and UK, proposed deleting the reference to the decision on the first Global Stocktake (GST) ([decision 1/CMA.5](#)) from the preamble. The ARAB GROUP also requested deleting text reiterating the invitation to UN organizations and others to support NAP implementation in LDCs and support them in achieving the goals referred to in paragraph 59 of decision 1/CMA.5 (having NAPs in place by 2025 and having progressed their implementation by 2030). The LDCs disagreed, preferring to keep the original language. Co-Facilitator den Hoedt, requesting Parties to accept previously agreed language, noted that the wording is identical to that in the COP 29 decision on LDC matters ([decision 15/CP.29](#)).

The UK, EU, and LDCs expressed their support to “welcome” the updated technical guidelines for the process to formulate and implement NAPs, with the ARAB GROUP preferring to “take note.”

Parties reached convergence on a draft decision to be forwarded to COP 30 for adoption.

Other Issues

Report for 2024 and 2025 on the annual Dialogue on the GST informing NDC preparation (referred to in paragraph 187 of decision 1/CMA.5): In CMA informal consultations, Co-Facilitator Noura Alissa (Saudi Arabia) introduced an informal note and invited Parties’ views on the text. Most Parties expressed satisfaction with, or suggested minor edits to, the first three paragraphs, which appreciate the organization of the Dialogue, welcome the reports of the 2024 and 2025 Dialogue, and note the views shared during the Dialogue.

NORWAY, AOSIS, the EIG, AILAC, the EU, and others supported including key messages from the Dialogue, such as: the importance of keeping 1.5°C within reach; urging parties to submit GST-aligned NDCs; and the need for enhanced ambition and for finance to close the ambition gap. The LMDCs, RUSSIAN FEDERATION, and ARAB GROUP opposed including any substantive elements.

The LDCs underlined that the [decision](#) establishing the Dialogue specifies a focus on how the GST outcomes are informing the preparation of Parties’ next NDCs without making a specific reference to the first GST and that there is therefore no mandate to decide on the conclusion of the Dialogue. NORWAY and the EIG supported specifying the annual Dialogue has no end date. The AFRICAN GROUP, ARAB GROUP, LMDCs, and others preferred deciding the conclusion of the Dialogue, with

some suggesting it concluded at SB 62, while others supported concluding it after another session at SB 64. SOUTH AFRICA said the Dialogue should not run in parallel with GST-2 and suggested the possibility of “leaving the door open” to reconsider the need for another dialogue.

The Co-Facilitators will revise the informal note.

Just Transition Work Programme (JTWP): In the SBI contact group, Co-Chair Joseph Teo (Singapore) introduced a revised informal note. Most Parties welcomed the balanced reflection of views, with the LMDCs lamenting a skewed representation of input on UTMs.

On institutional arrangements, the EU proposed a just transition action plan, to be hosted by the UNFCCC Secretariat with clear time-bound activities and functions based on the elements of the JTWP, including facilitating knowledge exchange, enhancing capacity, and ensuring participation of non-party stakeholders, among others. Co-Chair Teo noted the plan has some overlap with the just transition mechanism proposed by the G-77/CHINA and invited parties to consult. CUBA indicated interest in discussing this in informal informals, and the LMDCs noted the action plan can complement the mechanism.

AOSIS, the LDCs, EIG, AUSTRALIA, JAPAN, and the UK supported language on the inherent connection between pursuing efforts to limit the temperature increase to 1.5°C and pursuing just transition pathways. The LMDCs and ARAB GROUP supported alternative language referencing the “inherent connection between pursuing efforts to limit the temperature increase to well below 2°C and pursuing efforts to limit it to 1.5°C, scaled-up adaptation action, and the fulfilment of developed countries’ means of implementation obligations to enable developing countries to respond to climate change in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication, and recognizes that such outcomes are pursued through nationally determined just transition pathways.”

AOSIS, the LDCs, EIG, CANADA, and the UK supported, and the LMDCs and ARAB GROUP rejected, language inviting the work programme to integrate GST outcomes relevant to just transition. The ARAB GROUP objected to language on transitioning away from fossil fuels, lamenting it is “against the spirit of the Paris Agreement” which recognizes national circumstances. The RUSSIAN FEDERATION stressed the text should capture negative aspects of renewable energy. The UK rejected language on transition fuels, with COLOMBIA calling them a false solution.

PARAGUAY requested that “gender equality” be replaced with “equality between women and men.” AILAC and the EIG stressed the need to retain gender-based approaches. The LMDCs called for using human rights language agreed under the Paris Agreement.

Discussions continued in the evening.

Gender: In SBI informal consultations co-facilitated by Carol Franco (Dominican Republic) and Jared Huntley (Australia), Parties shared views on revisions to activities in the informal note, with a view to forward draft text to the COP.

On the participation of women in delegations at UNFCCC sessions, the EU and CANADA called for text that emphasizes the “full, equal, and meaningful” participation of women. IRAN

disagreed with the addition of “equal,” stating that this should be for governments to decide and that selecting delegations depends on available expertise. THE GAMBIA noted their preference to include “African women,” with SENEGAL calling for the addition of women of “African descent.”

Discussions continued into the night.

Research and systematic observation: In SBSTA informal consultations co-facilitated by Patricia Nyinguro (Kenya) and Frank McGovern (Ireland), Parties continued to discuss draft text.

SAUDI ARABIA called for deleting a reference to enhancing efforts to “counter misinformation.” Pointing to discussions during the previous informal consultations, the Co-Facilitators suggested enhancing “communication,” which SAUDI ARABIA considered “unnecessary.” With regard to a reference to the IPCC’s planned efforts to enhance inclusivity, INDIA stressed that unless Parties come to a shared understanding of what inclusivity means, they cannot agree to any reference to inclusivity.

Discussions continued in the evening.

Arrangements for intergovernmental meetings: In an SBI contact group, co-chaired by Marianne Karlsen (Norway) and Kaveh Guilanpour (Georgia), Parties discussed a new iteration of draft conclusions.

AOSIS suggested including more specific language on capacity-building for youth and budgetary matters, which several Parties opposed. In relation to an invitation for Parties to pursue efficiency in the consideration of agenda items, CHINA, opposed by the EU and EIG, proposed adding a caveat highlighting the party-driven nature of the process.

The LDCs, EIG, and EU signaled they were ready to accept the text while expressing disappointment over its lack of ambition and stressing the importance of future work to improve the efficiency of the UNFCCC process.

Parties converged on the draft conclusions without the edits suggested by AOSIS, but with China’s caveat.

In The Corridors

A peaceful protest held by Indigenous Peoples briefly blocked access to the venue in the morning, granting participants some minutes of additional sunshine before they once again disappeared into the windowless den of the Blue Zone.

In some rooms, participants lauded the constructive “we-are-in-this-together” spirit pushing items ever closer to the finish line. Others were still ploughing through many pages of more or less bracketed text. Delegates working on the procedure of the next Global Stocktake had different perspectives on the status quo reached in informal informals, whereas it took a lengthy back-and-forth for those working on *ex ante* climate finance to even hold such discussions.

No less than 15 informal consultations were scheduled for the evening. “At this rate, maybe I should bring my pajamas,” noted a delegate who faces a long commute to their distant accommodation. Intimate encounters of a different kind were generated by the venue’s unlockable bathroom doors. “That’s not the kind of transparency I was hoping for in this process,” quipped one observer who decided to skip out early. Delegates might get little sleep this night. Anticipating traffic disruptions caused by Saturday’s Peoples’ Summit March, the Secretariat advised all participants to arrive at the venue before 9:00 am.