

Belém Climate Change Conference: Wednesday, 19 November 2025

Many delegates spent a good part of their day waiting—whether for guidance to emerge from the higher-level consultations, for Parties to report on progress achieved in informal informals, or for new texts to be released. The announced plenary never materialized. Technical-level negotiators were doing their best to clean up their draft texts. Some, such as those working on non-market cooperative approaches for implementing the Paris Agreement, succeeded. Negotiations on a host of issues continued through the night.

Presidency Consultations

Cooperation with other international organizations: Luiz de Andrade Filho, COP 30 Presidency, invited Parties' views on an informal note.

Most Parties lamented that the informal note does not reflect a balance of all views expressed to date. CANADA, the EU, UK, EIG, MAURITIUS, LIBERIA, THE GAMBIA, ARMENIA, and MONGOLIA requested adding substantive elements of the discussions to the text, including on, among others: modalities of work; strengthening synergies between the Rio Conventions; enhanced transparency and accountability regarding how the Joint Liaison Group operates; and cross-cutting issues like gender and human rights. CANADA proposed revising the note to request the Secretariat to: prepare a synthesis report, ahead of SBSTA 64, of the agreed submissions on enhancing the inclusiveness of cooperation with other international organizations and cooperation with other Rio Conventions Secretariats; and present to SBSTA 64 on cooperation with international organizations, with a focus on the work of the Joint Liaison Group.

SAUDI ARABIA, the RUSSIAN FEDERATION, COLOMBIA, PANAMA, CHINA, ARMENIA, INDONESIA nevertheless supported going forward with the note as is.

The Presidency will present the document to the COP for adoption.

Enhanced engagement of local communities: Marco Túlio Scarpelli Cabral, COP 30 Presidency, invited views on draft text.

The ALLIANCE OF SMALL ISLAND STATES (AOSIS) highlighted that the critical balance of representation between Parties and Indigenous Peoples in the Facilitative Working Group (FWG) has enabled important outcomes. They underscored that

adding seats on the FWG for local communities would affect that balance, especially if Parties would receive equivalent additional seats without giving consideration to Indigenous Peoples, and recalled that previous FWG reviews did not reach a conclusion on this matter.

AOSIS, the EU, NORWAY, AUSTRALIA, CANADA, and NEW ZEALAND emphasized that the participation of local communities in the FWG needs careful deliberation and called for consideration of the matter during the 2027 review of the FWG. NORWAY and CANADA opposed for a report on the Presidency's consultations on ways to further engage local communities to be presented to COP 31 for appropriate action, stating this could prejudice the outcome of the 2027 review process, and that it should rather feed into the review to be concluded at COP 32.

BENIN highlighted that local communities are on the frontlines of the climate crisis, possess valuable traditional knowledge, and play a vital role in the restoration of fragile ecosystems. They called for more resources, training, regional exchanges, and cooperation to promote the inclusion of local communities in decision-making processes.

The Presidency will revise the draft text.

Technical-Level Negotiations

Clean Development Mechanism (CDM): Discussions during CMP informal consultations co-facilitated by Peer Stiansen (Norway) and Alick Muvundika (Zambia) focused on the transfer of funds from the CDM Trust Fund, with the Co-Facilitators noting the amount available to be transferred is USD 26.8 million.

Parties discussed whether to transfer the funds to: the Article 6.4 mechanism; the Adaptation Fund; or support capacity-building activities. The UK, supported by ALLIANCE OF LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN (AILAC) and the EU, proposed transferring the entire amount to the Article 6.4 mechanism. The UK added that could be coupled with providing guidance to the Supervisory Body to increase the amount spent on capacity-building.

The AFRICAN GROUP preferred allocating specific amounts across all three options, suggesting USD 5 million to the Adaptation Fund, USD 5 million for capacity-building, and the remaining amount to Article 6.4. The LEAST DEVELOPED COUNTRIES (LDCs) supported USD 5 million for capacity-building and transferring the remaining amount to Article 6.4.

The LIKE-MINDED DEVELOPING COUNTRIES (LMDCs) preferred an equal allocation across all three options.

After additional consultations, the AFRICAN GROUP, supported by most Parties, but opposed by the LMDCs, proposed: transferring the entire amount to Article 6.4 with USD 5 million earmarked for capacity-building; specifying that any balance left in the CDM Trust Fund after this transfer to Article 6.4 and the conclusion of the CDM operations will be transferred to the Adaptation Fund; and also deciding that the repayment of the new amount to be transferred, as well as the USD 30 million transferred in response to [decision 2/CMP.16](#), will be allocated to the Adaptation Fund.

The Co-Facilitators will report back to the Presidency that no agreement could be reached.

Budgetary matters relating to the International Transaction Log (ITL) under the Kyoto Protocol: During CMP informal consultations facilitated by Abzeita Djigma (Burkina Faso), discussions focused on the possible destination for the unspent balances of the ITL Trust Fund. Most Parties, including AOSIS, NORWAY, and the LDCs, supported directing the funds to support the further development of the Paris Agreement Article 6.2 infrastructure, specifically the international registry. The LMDCs preferred an equal allocation to support the Article 6.2 infrastructure and address the impact of the implementation of response measures.

Facilitator Djigma will report to the Presidency that no agreement could be reached.

Paris Agreement Article 6.2 (bilateral cooperative approaches): In CMA informal consultations, Co-Facilitators Peer Stiansen (Norway) and Pacifica Achieng Ogola (Kenya) proposed that Parties undertake a “focused huddle” on the specific issues where divergence remains.

Reporting back after the huddle, NEW ZEALAND noted Parties had reached consensus on some issues, such as the preambular references to previously issued guidance, but that divergence remains on, among others, some of the issues relating to inconsistencies in Parties’ reporting. The Co-Facilitators offered to prepare revised text for Parties’ consideration, noting “we have this room until midnight, so there is still time to get it right.” Consultations continued late into the night.

Paris Agreement Article 6.4 (crediting mechanism): In CMA informal consultations, Co-Facilitators Sonam Tashi (Bhutan) and Kate Hancock (Australia) presented a new draft text, drawing attention to changes to paragraphs on the funding of the mechanism’s operation. They noted there was still no consensus on two further issues discussed in the previous night’s huddle: extending the deadline for host party approvals of the transition of CDM activities; and the terms of the Article 6.4 Supervisory Body (SBM) members. The Co-Facilitators urged Parties to work on compromises and invited them to first reflect on the new paragraphs.

Parties shared divergent views on the scale of funds that would be transferred from the CDM Trust Fund, with AOSIS requesting a reference to USD 26.8 million. The LMDCs stressed that working with the new funding paragraphs required discussing the other unresolved issues in parallel.

Parties then huddled to seek consensus on sections relating to: transparency and stakeholder engagement; and methodologies

and standards. Reporting back, SWITZERLAND and NEW ZEALAND shared there had been convergence on paragraphs relating to: transparency of decision-making of the SBM and the Methodological Expert Panel; strengthening of the SBM’s stakeholder consultation processes; and deletion of a paragraph on clarifying the definitions of reductions, avoidance, and removals.

Discussions continued in informal informals in the evening.

Paris Agreement Article 6.8 (non-market approaches): In CMA informal consultations, Co-Facilitator Jacqui Ruesga (New Zealand) invited Parties to confirm agreement on a new draft text iteration prepared on the basis of informal informals held through the night. Parties agreed to forward the text to the Presidency for adoption by the CMA.

Consultative Group of Experts (CGE): In COP informal consultations, Co-Facilitators Hans Kolshus (Norway) and Tian Wang (China) invited a report back from informal informals. AUSTRALIA reported good progress, stating that delegates managed to agree on most minor issues, with only key points of contention remaining.

Discussions continued in informal informals and further informal consultations were scheduled for late in the evening.

Review of the functions of the Climate Technology Centre: In COP/CMA informal consultations co-facilitated by Tosi Mpanu Mpanu (Democratic Republic of the Congo) and Mattias Frumerie (Sweden), the EU reported on progress in informal informals, noting that Parties: managed to clear most of the draft decision text, with brackets remaining around the provision of support for the CTC; and agreed on approximately half of the annexed text on revising the CTC’s functions.

Discussions continued in informal informals and informal consultations reconvened in the evening.

In The Corridors

After burning the midnight oil for two days, delegates arrived at the venue hoping to see the “Mutirão” decision, which the Presidency was keen on adopting two days before the official closure of the conference. Instead, participants were greeted with a very light negotiation schedule, covering non-“Mutirão” items, and uncertainty regarding the fate of key issues like the Global Goal on Adaptation and just transition work programme.

Rumors circulated about a potential afternoon plenary to be attended by Brazilian President Lula himself, which never materialized, just like the much-awaited decision texts. The idle time gave many observers and delegates the opportunity to roam the venue and finally try the crowd-drawing ice cream.

More whispers then started spreading about a potential agreement within the Western European and Others Group regarding the host of the next session of the Conference of the Parties (COP), word being that it will take place in Antalya, with some kind of arrangement to be worked out between Türkiye and Australia as to the actual Presidency over the negotiations.

“Well, the Germans were clearly not keen for it to fall to them,” noted a delegate, “and Bonn may not be too poor, but it certainly is too small to host a proper COP these days.” Yet, many were already anxious to see a fraught partnership emerge between the unlikely partners. “And what happens to the Pacific amid all this?” wondered an observer: “A Pacific pre-COP does not make for a substantive outcome for the most vulnerable.”