

ClimaTalk COP30 Debrief



WEEK 1

ClimaTalk is tracking COP30 negotiations and is making them accessible for youth at home and on the ground. For more information see the COP30 section on our website [here](#), and follow us on Instagram (@climataalk) and LinkedIn. You can also download our guide to “Decoding UNFCCC Language” [here](#).

COP? SB63? CMA7? CMP20? - What happens when?

During the first week of COP, Parties negotiate under the guidance of the Chairs of the Subsidiary Bodies, that are the **Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI)** chaired by Julia Gardiner (Australia) and the **Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA)** chaired by Adonia Ayebare (Uganda). Similar to the SBs in June, these meetings consist largely of technical and negotiation phases, thus laying the groundwork for adopting decisions and reaching formal agreements under the **COP Presidency** (this year: Brazil). Technically speaking, while negotiations during COP go on for two weeks, the meetings during the first week are guided by the SBs Chair while those during week happen under Brazilian Presidency. Therefore, it can happen that when no decision or draft text was reached until the end of week 1, negotiations start anew during the second week - that is, unless Parties agree to continue working on the old documents.

Whereas the **Conference of Parties (COP)** is the highest body under the UNFCCC and thus deals with overarching climate governance, the [Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement \(CMA\)](#) also reunites Parties that are members of the Paris Agreement to work towards the effective implementation of the Paris Agreement. Although the Paris Agreement celebrates its 10-year anniversary this year, Belém only hosts CMA7. COP30 also serves as CMP20, that is the 20th meeting of the [Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol \(CMP\)](#). In this framework, Parties that signed the Kyoto Protocol aim to oversee its implementation and take decisions to reach this goal.

Negotiations Across the Rooms

Negotiations do not remain within negotiations rooms but play out across various rooms, topics, and working groups. This means that Parties act strategically, often willing to compromise on one topic while asking other Parties to agree to their priorities in another room. For instance, while some Parties were willing to step back from some of their demands under the Mitigation Work Programme to reach a decision, they were hoping for their opponents to do the same for the sake of reaching a decision under the Just Transition Work Programme. Overall, this strategizing can be compared to playing chess. Sometimes, sacrifices must be made in one negotiation room in order to reach an overarching goal of the Party's strategy; losing a pawn, but keeping your Queen!

Recurring Disagreements

Although every negotiation centers on a different topic (e.g. mitigation, adaptation, finance), some conflicts recur in various rooms. During the first week at COP30, developed and developing countries disagreed on including language on unilateral trade measures, the 1.5°C temperature goal, and the provision of finance from developed to developing countries (in line with Article 9.1 of the Paris Agreement)

Unilateral Trade Measures: actions taken by a country to restrict or open its trade with others, however without waiting for agreement from other countries (e.g. tariffs, sanctions, etc.). They can be instrumentalized as a tool for foreign policy or simply to achieve domestic objectives.

- **Developing Countries** argue that these measures can potentially hinder their sustainable development, exacerbate poverty, and increase the divide between the Global North and the Global South.
- **Developed countries** disagree with this interpretation of unilateral measures, arguing that they are a way to prevent carbon leakage and encourage global climate action.
- **Civil Society Groups advocate for a BAM (Belém Action Mechanism) instead of CBAM** (Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism) to reflect the right to development, honor equity, and promote national sovereignty.

1.5° Temperature Goal: This goal, a prominent key objective of the Paris Agreement, aims to limit global warming to 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels. Albeit politically relevant, recent scientific assessments suggest that this critical threshold could already be breached by 2030 unless greenhouse gas emissions are reduced significantly.

- Developed Nations, specifically EU, UK, Australia, and Norway [advocate](#) for its inclusion in the text
- Other Parties, including Egypt and China want this understated
- Other developing Parties, including Nepal, Bhutan and Bangladesh frame the 1.5°C temperature goal as a matter of survival and hence advocate for increasing national ambitions in the NDCs

Provision of finance: “Developed country Parties shall provide financial resources to assist developing country Parties with respect to both mitigation and adaptation” (Article 9.1 Paris Agreement)

- Like-minded developing countries (LMDCs) reminded developed countries of their responsibility under Article 9.1 of the Paris Agreement, advocated for an implementation of this paragraph and proposed the implementation of a work programme to foster discussions. In contrast, Australia emphasized prioritizing the implementation of the NCGQ, pointing out that is already encompasses Article 9.1
- AOSIS, Norway, Australia and others called for a ‘response plan’: Parties who included ranges in their newly submitted NDCs should aim to move towards the more ambitious ends in their plans. In addition, donor countries are encouraged to include finance in their NDCs)

TOPIC UPDATES

The topics that are covered in this update are:

- Global Stocktake
- Just Transition
- Loss & Damage
- Climate Finance
- Article 6
- Gender
- Food & Agriculture
- ACE (Action for Climate Empowerment)
- NDCs (Nationally Determined Contributions)
- Mitigation
- Adaptation
- NAPs (National Adaptation Plans)
- Oceans
- Biodiversity

This debrief was completed on the evening of Friday 14th November. Please note, policy discussions are evolving rapidly, and we'll share another update at the end of COP30 to keep you fully informed. Stay tuned!

Please note that we have done our best to ensure that all updates are accurate, up to date and cover the most important issues and developments. However, if you notice a mistake or missing piece of information, please email us at office@climataalk.org with the subject line "Week 1 Correction" and we will correct and update this live document.

Global Stocktake

It is noticeable that the negotiations are stalling partly due to the lack of an effective counterweight to Saudi Arabia—backed firmly by India and China—which continues to shape the emerging-economy coalition's defensive stance. A new consolidated text was issued, but no real progress was made. The main divide concerns scope, with developed countries seeking coverage of all GST outcomes while emerging economies insist on limiting it to means of implementation. The same divide applies to outputs, where developed countries want substantive products and LMDCs reject any. Recent exchanges centred on whether certain proposals would turn the dialogue into a duplication of the GST, a key red line for several emerging economies.

Discussions on refining the GST process revealed strong pushback from emerging economies—particularly China, India, Saudi Arabia, and the Arab Group—against framing the IPCC as the sole “best available science,” arguing it should not be elevated above other sources. There is broad convergence that the political phase should be longer, but Parties remain divided on how—whether to shorten the technical phase, allow phase overlap, or introduce intersessional work. No consensus emerged on adding Loss & Damage as a separate thematic area, despite strong advocacy from island states and several Latin American countries.

AT A GLANCE:

- New texts were introduced on both negotiation tracks.
- Divisions and tensions from previous sessions remain strong.

- It is essential that the UAE dialogue discussion does not duplicate the GST.
- Particularly concerning was the pushback by some Parties on the IPCC being the best available science.
- A rare point of convergence is that Parties want a longer political phase of the GST.

Just Transition

After a historic breakthrough in Bonn in June, the Parties came into COP with an “informal note” on the UAE Just Transition Work Programme. Although they may not have been able to reach any concrete decision, the informal note still matters, as its completion - albeit with gaps left in areas where Parties just couldn’t come to agreement - means it’s being formally considered at this COP. However, one issue stalling negotiations is the increasingly wide scope of issues that Parties wanted to have included in the final decision.

Negotiations rapidly regressed this week: Parties disagree on changes the informal note’s phrasing, particularly on inclusion of references to the 1.5 degree limit. Where developed countries, including Australia, the UK, EU and Norway see 1.5 as essential to include, other Parties, including Egypt and China, want this understated.

Parties split along the same fault lines as at Bonn when it came to discussion of one key issue - trade. On the 13th of November, most of the contact group’s negotiation time was spent on discussions surrounding the Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanisms (CBAMs), which is when a country like the UK increases the price of “carbon intensive” products imported from other countries. The UK, and other countries using CBAMs, say that it leads to industries reducing global emissions, and without them, carbon emissions are just displaced; Parties at COP including the LMDC, G77 and China, and Arab Group, call it protectionism, and argued that such measures were unfairly punishing developing economies. The Like-Minded Group of Developing Countries declared they would not accept any Just Transition decision that didn’t condemn unilateral trade measures; other parties, like the Philippines, and Fiji (speaking for AOSIS) took a more measured approach, though they still sided with the G77, calling for a wider range of pathways to help developing economies decarbonise without decrying all trade measures.

Canada, the UK, the EU and Norway all complained that this was irrelevant to trade discussion; for them, this was undermining the Just Transition Work Programme and watering it down. Japan called for deleting references to climate finance on the grounds it was being discussed in other rooms; Egypt made the same case for removing references to the Global Stocktake (which would assess Parties’ progress towards the Paris Agreement Climate Goals). On November 12th, Parties asked for more references to adaptation and mitigation in the Just Transition, which developed countries protested. Cuba and the EU disagreed on the relevance of the topic of human rights.

The amount of time spent discussing the substance of the JTWP decision itself has been limited as a result. A new draft text was expected by Friday November 14th, though this is yet to materialise.

AT A GLANCE:

- Tensions arose between parties on the topic of trade, with the UK complaining they were the victim of “finger-pointing”.
- Parties cannot agree on what is relevant to Just Transition.
- Developing countries have clashed with developed countries, calling for removal of references to the 1.5 limit in the final decision.
- Similar to last year, the LMDC will not accept a final decision that does not condemn unilateral trade measures such as Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanisms.

Loss & Damage

The newly established Fund for Responding to Loss and Damage (FRLD) has made a major step forward by issuing its first call for funding proposals, signalling a shift from design to deployment of loss-and-damage finance. Concurrently, negotiators are advancing discussions on the Warsaw International Mechanism for Loss and Damage (WIM) third review and engaging with the Santiago Network for Loss and Damage for technical assistance to vulnerable countries.

However, several issues remain unresolved: key deliberations continue around eligibility criteria, delivery modalities, and ensuring direct community access to the FRLD funds points flagged as critical for ensuring that the most affected and marginalised populations benefit. At the same time, civil society participants emphasise that non-economic losses such as cultural heritage, livelihoods, and identity losses must be factored into operationalisation of the fund, underlining that the architecture must be inclusive and justice-based.

AT A GLANCE:

- The new Fund for Responding to Loss and Damage (FRLD) made a major step by issuing its first call for proposals, marking a shift from design to delivery.
- Negotiators continued work on the Warsaw International Mechanism for Loss and Damage (WIM) third review and advanced technical support discussions under the Santiago Network.
- Key operational issues remain unresolved, including eligibility, delivery modalities, and ensuring direct access for affected communities.
- Civil society stressed the need to include non-economic losses (culture, identity, livelihoods) and to build an inclusive, justice-based fund architecture.

Climate Finance

Discussions on Climate Finance in week one focused on developing a clear definition and pathway of what “consistent flows of finance” means for various parties, with the ambition that works on article 2.1 will conclude at Belem.

During the various Sharma El Sheikh dialogues on the scope of article 2.1 of the Paris Agreement and its complementarity with article 9 of the Paris Agreement, parties debated on whether there was a common understanding of article 2.1 and called for clear and descriptive procedural safeguards to ensure that the articulation of article 2.1 is in a nationally determined manner and takes different context and approaches, integrating not only mitigation but adaptation.

Parties also urged that the Baku to Belem T\$1.3 Roadmap report published on the 5th of November 2025 and presented by the COP29 and COP30 Presidencies to mobilize the funds in climate finance annually by 2035 must clearly distinguish that it is a scaling up on finalize while the NCQG is a commitment by developed countries.

For parties, the NCQG is a call of action whose next steps were agreed in Baku with an accountability cycle for progress tracking set to begin in 2028. However, parties expressed concern that the NCQG makes no mention of grants to adaptation and crisis, emphasizing that countries should not get into debt to tackle climate disasters.

The Tropical Forest Forever Facility, a Brazilian-led conservation initiative, is designed to eliminate the economic incentives behind deforestation. The market-based plan would pay countries to keep their tropical forests intact, setting aside 20 percent of the funding specifically for Indigenous and local communities. China has refused to contribute to the fund, maintaining that wealthier nations must pay a larger share.

Week one of the COP30 negotiations still ends with questions that have been asked a million times over, “How

do we equitably finance climate action at a large scale?” “How do we deal with finance that is considered inconsistent with climate financing?”

AT A GLANCE:

- In the Sharm El-Sheikh dialogues, parties debated the meaning and scope of Article 2.1(c) and its relationship to Article 9, calling for procedural safeguards and nationally determined approaches that include both mitigation and adaptation.
- Parties stressed that the *Baku to Belém T\$1.3 Roadmap* (released 5 November 2025) must clarify that it represents a scaling-up effort, while the NCQG remains a formal obligation of developed countries.
- China will not join Brazil’s TFFF (Tropical Forests Forever Facility) initiative.
- Parties raised concerns that the NCQG lacks commitments for adaptation and crisis-related grants, emphasising that countries should not incur debt to respond to climate impacts.

Article 6

Discussions on Article 6, which governs international carbon markets, have focused on implementation challenges and the integrity of carbon removal projects, following the finalisation at COP29. A major point of activity has been the ongoing work of the Article 6.4 Supervisory Body (A6.4 SB), which has been accelerated to establish the necessary standards for the new market mechanism.

Integrity and Removals: The Article 6.4 Supervisory Body made a major technical step by endorsing standards for mitigation activities involving removals. This includes provisions designed to manage the risk of reversals, allowing methodologies to be tailored to specific nature-based projects to increase their viability while protecting integrity.

Inclusivity, and Transparency: Concerns were raised regarding the transparency and inclusivity of the negotiation process. The African Group of Negotiators highlighted the challenge of coordinating views between 55 countries when texts are only made available a few days before a session. There is a call from numerous Parties and groups for greater gender balance within the Article 6.4 Supervisory Body and a need for greater inclusivity and transparency across the mechanism’s governance.

Operational Capacity: The greatest non-political obstacle remains the widespread capacity gap in developing countries. Few have submitted the necessary initial Reports to the UNFCCC’s platform, highlighting a need for rapid support to build systems for MRV (Monitoring, Reporting, and Verification) and legal authorisation of carbon credits.

Market Implementation: Progress on bilateral market cooperation (Article 6.2) is visible through concrete implementation agreements. For example, Papua New Guinea and Brazil are actively progressing agreements with partners like Singapore and Switzerland to “road test” the market and define authorisation arrangements for Internationally Transferred Mitigation Outcomes (ITMOs).

AT A GLANCE:

- The focus is now on implementing International Carbon Markets and resolving the capacity gaps for host countries.
- Negotiations were criticised for low transparency and providing groups insufficient time to review texts.
- The Article 6.4 Supervisory Body endorsed technical standards, including crucial rules for managing non-permanence in carbon removal projects.
- Low readiness is a major issue, with few countries submitting the foundational reports needed to participate.
- Bilateral cooperation (Article 6.2) is advancing through specific agreements, such as those involving Brazil and Papua New Guinea with other countries.

Gender

During the first negotiation, on November 11th, co-facilitators presented the first draft of the new Gender Action Plan (GAP), to be finalized by the end of the week. Parties reaffirmed the importance of gender responsive climate action, and confirmed their approval for the 10-year GAP extension. Countries called for streamlining the text, merging activities and making them more actionable.

The co-facilitators returned on November 13th with a new draft text, which did not combine activities due to a lack of consensus. Parties still expressed the need to make the text more “manageable”. The Russian Federation, Iran and the Arab Group expressed “serious concern” over “controversial elements” in the text, such as gender-diverse people. This brought negotiations to a standstill. Unable to reach consensus, parties called for an informal meeting on Thursday, where co-chairs suggested focusing on areas of agreement, rather than red lines. On Friday evening at 7pm, Parties had the final consultation and went through almost the entire 34-page text which currently has 277 brackets. They sent it to COP for the plenary. There were a lot of calls for regressive language from Paraguay, the Russian Federation and Iran, especially on the use of the word “gender” as only meaning biological sex, and removing the mention of environmental and human rights defenders.

AT A GLANCE:

- Aim of discussions: finalising the new 9 year long Gender Action Plan (GAP).
- A revised GAP was introduced after the first contact group, following discussions on its length and actionability
- The draft received pushback from the Russian Federation and Arab Group, due to “controversial concepts” such as “gender-diverse people”.
- An informal meeting was scheduled for Thursday to try to reach a consensus by the Friday deadline; during the informal consultation on Friday evening Parties went through almost the entire 34-page text - which currently has 277 brackets.

Food & Agriculture

During COP30 Week 1, negotiations under the Sharm el-Sheikh Joint Work on Agriculture and Food Security focused heavily on finance, coherence across workstreams, and the urgent need for systemic and holistic approaches to agriculture. Parties broadly recognized that agriculture receives only a small portion of climate finance, and developing countries repeatedly stressed the need for predictable, accessible, and grant-based support to implement adaptation measures. Groups such as G77+China, LDCs, and Grupo Sur emphasized challenges of coordination and time constraints, noting that many parties were not ready to submit text due to lack of time to consolidate positions. Despite this, there was convergence on safeguarding food security, strengthening resilience, and elevating the role of farmers, Indigenous Peoples, women, youth, and children.

Discussions revealed tension between the desire for progress and the limitations of the negotiation schedule. Multiple parties called for more time to coordinate, leading co-facilitators to focus Week 1 on consultations rather than drafting conclusions. Four different text proposals were submitted, and many parties, led by the UK, EU, Switzerland, and G77+China, supported granting facilitators a mandate to merge texts into a balanced draft, while others, especially Saudi Arabia and several LDCs, cautioned that this would be premature. Observer groups (farmers, IPO, women and gender, youth) raised strong concerns around equity, agroecology, traditional knowledge, and risks associated with Article 6 and poorly defined “climate-smart” approaches, urging parties not to entrench harmful market mechanisms.

By the end of Week 1, co-facilitators acknowledged that a lack of conclusions does not mean a lack of

progress. Instead, the week resulted in a consolidated understanding of Party positions to carry into Bonn next year. The Presidency shared neutral text reflecting “the state of play,” with most paragraphs bracketed due to unresolved differences. Across all sessions, parties reaffirmed the importance of strengthening the SSJW Online Portal, addressing harmful subsidies, improving policy coherence, and ensuring that upcoming workshops (SB64) deliver clearer direction on means of implementation for agriculture. Youth representatives submitted a compilation of over sixty youth-led projects to the portal and reiterated the need for justice-centered approaches that prioritize smallholder farmers, Indigenous Peoples, and children and youth.

AT A GLANCE:

- Week 1 centred on finance and coherence, with limited coordination time resulting in a focus on consultations over drafting, though party positions were clarified.
- LDCs called for predictable, grant-based support and a more systemic approach to food security.
- Parties aligned on elevating farmers, Indigenous Peoples, women and children, and youth representatives submitted a compilation of over sixty youth-led projects to the portal.
- The risks of vague “climate-smart” or market-based approaches were stressed.

ACE (Action for Climate Empowerment)

Ahead of COP30, on 26th August, the fourth annual summary report under the 10-year Glasgow work programme on Action for Climate Empowerment was published (available here). During Week 1 of COP30, Parties agreed on a draft decision (available here) which the SBI recommended and the COP and CMA later adopted. The decision requests the SBI to organise an interactive technical workshop to be held at the 2026 Dialogue on Action for Climate Empowerment, and invites Parties and non-Party stakeholders to submit views on matters to be addressed during that Dialogue.

On Day 4 of COP30 (13 November), the spotlight was on education, and this theme took center stage in the discussions.

One of the key highlights was the ACE Presidency Event – Empowering an Informed and Engaged Society for Effective Climate Action, co-hosted by Action for Climate Empowerment (ACE), the UNFCCC, and the COP30 Presidency. The event examined the Glasgow Work Programme on ACE, specifically the ACE4 priorities adopted at COP26. It explored how ACE can collaborate with youth, communicators, civil society, and educators to strengthen information integrity. This integrity is vital for the effective implementation of ACE and for driving ambitious climate action.

In addition, the Ministerial Roundtable on Greening Education, co-hosted by UNESCO and Brazil, showcased how teachers and schools worldwide are preparing to build resilience and equip future generations to face the challenges of climate change.

AT A GLANCE:

- During Week 1 of COP30, Parties agreed on a draft decision which the SBI recommended and the COP and CMA later adopted.
- The focus is on implementing the Glasgow Work Programme (ACE4 priorities) and improving information integrity through collaboration with stakeholders.
- Parties stressed the trustworthy, accessible climate information is essential for empowering engaged, climate-literate societies.
- A Ministerial Roundtable showcased global efforts to equip schools, teachers and students with the skills needed for resilience and climate action.

NDCs (Nationally Determined Contributions)

During week one of COP30, the major point of focus for NDC discussions was on the BTR synthesis report and NDC submissions. The BTR (Biennial Transparency Report) Synthesis Report, published October 31st, 2025, compiles submissions from over 100 Parties and outlines progress towards NDCs. Widely recognised by Parties during discussions, the report underscores persistent gaps in implementation, ambition, and support across mitigation, adaptation, and finance. Developing country groups – including African Group, LMDC, Arab Group, and LDCs – emphasised equity, CBDR, and historical responsibility, and raised repeated concerns about unilateral trade measures. Some also called for Article 9.1 finance to remain as a standalone outcome. Many (primarily developed) Parties urged those who have not submitted NDCs to do so urgently, and encouraged all Parties to move towards the highest end of their ambition levels.

AT A GLANCE:

- Strong support for multilateralism and the Paris Agreement's 10-year milestone, with mixed tones of optimism and caution.
- Developing country groups stressed the significance of equity, CBDR, historical responsibility, and protection from unilateral trade measures (UTM).
- Broad agreement that progress exists but major gaps persist in implementation, ambition, and especially finance (incl. safeguarding Article 9.1 which declares that developing countries “shall provide financial resources to assist developing country Parties).
- Calls for science-aligned, transparent NDCs/BTRs, with developed countries urging all Parties to submit enhanced 1.5°C-aligned NDCs.
- As of today 114 parties have submitted updated NDC's.

Mitigation

During the first week of COP30, the Parties under CMA Item 6 discussed the Sharm el-Sheikh Mitigation Ambition and Implementation Work Programme (MWP). The co-facilitators issued an informal note on November 12 summarizing the first two days of talks and negotiations on how to improve the programme. Most importantly, this includes ideas for stronger finance matchmaking, a possible digital Mitigation Platform and options of whether and how the MWP should continue beyond 2026.

In the session of November 13 the parties then provided initial reactions to the informal note. Many reaffirmed the 1.5 °C goal and the need to scale up implementation but diverged on key details. Developing countries mostly emphasized equity, access to finance and support for project implementation. Developed Countries called for a clearer structure and actionable outcomes. The countries also differed quite strongly in their preferred options for platform design and the future of MWP. Nevertheless, all countries recognized the MWP as an important platform for advancing ambition and for cooperation.

On the topic of fossil fuel mitigation the Leave it in the Ground Initiative (LINGO) talked about the Tropical Forest and Fossil Fuel (TFFF) framework. Vast fossil fuel reserves are under tropical forest and have the potential of emitting hundreds of gigatons of CO₂ if extracted. Therefore, the initiative links forest protection with fossil fuel phaseout by proposing sustainability-linked bonds that reward keeping fossil fuels in the ground. Through the TFFF LINGO reframes forest conservation as a tool to protect biodiversity and for climate mitigation.

AT A GLANCE:

- As a result of negotiations during Week 1 on the MWP, an Informal note was published to guide future work.

- Key areas of discussion included finance, digital platform and MWP continuation beyond 2026.
- Parties reaffirmed the 1.5°C goal but diverged on equity, finance access, structure and the future design of the MWP: LDC's stressed support for implementation whilst developed countries sought clearer, action-oriented outcomes.
- The Leave it on the Ground Initiative introduced the Tropical Forest and Fossil Fuel Framework, linking forest protection and FF phaseout by aiming to keep fossil reserves unextracted.

Adaptation

Throughout the first week of COP30, negotiators work with the hope to get the indicator list approved, plus stronger financial support and capacity-building for adaptation in developing countries. Much still depends on closing the finance gap in this "implementation COP". So far no definite word on the indicators.

Brazil launched the Belém Health Action Plan to support the health sector's adaptation to climate change, making it the first adaptation document to focus specifically on health. Philanthropist organizations have pledged an investment of USD 300 million.

During Week 1, developing countries, particularly the G77 + China, AOSIS, and the African Group pushed strongly for scaled-up, predictable adaptation finance within the new climate finance goal, arguing that current bilateral and multilateral flows remain far below needs. Small Island States highlighted escalating climate losses and pressed for faster operationalisation of the Loss and Damage Fund, emphasizing direct access for vulnerable communities.

On the other side, EU countries signaled willingness to strengthen adaptation support but continued to push for expanded donor responsibility suggesting that major emerging economies should also contribute. The United States emphasized private-sector mobilisation and flexibility in tracking adaptation finance, resisting proposals that would create binding finance obligations. Meanwhile, Brazil, as COP30 host, worked to bridge divides, calling for food systems adaptation, Amazon protection, and a balanced outcome across mitigation, adaptation, and finance.

AT A GLANCE:

- The focus is on securing agreement on the Global Goal on Adaptation indicator list, especially closing the major adaptation finance gap; no decision on indicators has emerged yet.
- The Belém Health Action Plan, supported by USD 300 million in philanthropic pledges, was launched.
- LDCs demanded scaled up, predictable adaptation finance and faster operationalisation of the Loss and Damage Fund.

NAPs (National Adaptation Plans)

The informal consultations under SBI agenda item 12(d) on National Adaptation Plans (NAPs) brought Parties together for four days of discussions focused mainly on means of implementation, particularly finance, and on advancing the draft text from the SB62 informal note. While all Parties recognized the urgent need to scale up support for NAP formulation and implementation, strong divergences remained over the nature of finance obligations, the role of private sector contributions, and the structure of enabling conditions in the text.

Negotiations were constructive but slow due to repeated debates over public vs. mixed finance sources, how clearly the text should reference developed-country obligations, and how extensively adaptation mainstreaming and enabling conditions should appear. LDCs offered a bridging proposal that received widespread support and is becoming the center of compromise. Several paragraphs were streamlined, merged, or updated, but the full text remains incomplete.

The session ended without a final outcome, and Parties agreed that the remaining unresolved issues would need to be taken forward to the COP30 Presidency for further negotiation in Belém.

AT A GLANCE:

- Finance remains the core political issue, with deep divides over public finance obligations versus broader “all sources” language.
- LDCs’ bridging text gained the widest support and is emerging as the most acceptable basis for compromise at COP30.
- Enabling conditions and mainstreaming sections are highly sensitive, with some groups seeking deletion while others insist they are essential for NAP implementation.
- Text is not finalized, and all unresolved issues, especially finance and structure, will be taken forward to the COP30 Presidency for final negotiation in Belém.

Oceans

Ocean issues featured prominently in the 2025 Ocean and Climate Change Dialogue, with Parties and observers calling for greater integration of ocean-related actions into the UNFCCC process. Key themes included scaling up ocean action in NDCs, supported by momentum from the Blue NDC Challenge, and the need for quantified and transparent targets supported by the Enhanced Transparency Framework. Delegates emphasized the importance of aligning ocean indicators with the GGA, strengthening ecosystem- and nature-based solutions (particularly blue carbon ecosystems), and promoting synergies between oceans, climate, and biodiversity in line with the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework and the outcomes of the 2025 UNOC. Many interventions emphasized the urgency of scaling up ocean-based mitigation and adaptation, including sustainable fisheries, climate-smart blue food systems, marine renewable energy, and coastal resilience.

A strong and repeated message came from SIDS, LDCs, and the Parties that support them: funding for ocean action is severely inadequate, and SDG14 remains the least funded development goal. Speakers highlighted the serious difficulties in accessing climate finance, calling for more equitable mechanisms, new financing channels under the UNFCCC, and stronger cooperation with the private sector. Delegations also stressed the importance of recognizing indigenous and local knowledge, the importance of the BBNJ agreement entering into force, and the need for the Ocean and Climate Change Dialogue to evolve into a space to monitor progress in integrating the ocean into UNFCCC decisions. Throughout the week, countries emphasized that the ocean has already protected the planet from the worst effects of climate change and that meeting the Paris Agreement will require elevating ocean-based climate action to a fundamental pillar of global climate efforts.

AT A GLANCE:

- Parties pushed for stronger integration of ocean action into the UNFCCC via quantified, transparent NDCs (Blue NDC Challenge).
- Small Island Developing States (SIDS) and Least Developed Countries (LDCs) called out the severe underfunding of ocean action, with SDG14 being the least funded development goal.
- Calls to recognise indigenous knowledge, and the ocean’s central role in meeting Paris Agreement goals.

Biodiversity

COP30 week 1’s nature discussions focused on synergies between the 3 Rio conventions - the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), the UN Convention on Biological Diversity, (CBD) and the UN Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD). The importance of the climate and nature nexus is being

increasingly understood, and with COP30 held at the mouth of the Amazon, a more integrated approach to climate and nature solutions has become highly relevant. The aim of synergies between the conventions is to try and bring discussions and solutions together, rather than tackling the climate, biodiversity and land use crises as separate issues.

Rio Synergies were being discussed under agenda item SBSTA 15. Parties expressed their support, and acknowledged the importance of synergies and cooperation, though there was a lot of disagreement on the timeline of these discussions. Some parties called to slow down the discussions, and to halt decision making until the next conference, SB64, in June. Reasons given for this hesitancy were parties not wanting to make decisions for decisions sake, and wanting to ensure that synergies would be effective, whilst also calling to prioritise other agenda items. However, the majority of parties called upon the framing of COP30 as 'the implementation COP' as an indicator of an imperative to act now and progress discussions past the procedural stage, to decisions and outcomes. Small Island Nations, especially Palau, are calling for urgent support and action, as they are facing the delocalised and disproportionate effects of the climate crisis.

This disagreement led to uncertainty and delays, as consensus was not reached. The Brazilian presidency allowed an extended hour for discussion after this was requested and supported by some parties, and after calls from the chair for parties to communicate with each other, a compromise was reached. The Brazilian Presidency has proposed to continue the discussion of this matter in week 2, and parties have agreed to engage constructively, with appropriate safeguards to ensure that whilst addressing their synergies, the separate agendas of the three Rio Conventions are also respected. Parties have also called for strengthening the Joint Liaison Group; the body including the secretariats of the three Rio Conventions. Parties have expressed a need for more discussion on mechanisms for international co-operation and greater emphasis on accountability to ensure that these synergies are effective. Looking to week 2, a summary text will be prepared based on the shared areas of interest of week 1, for further discussion.

Other tracks:

The critical role of forests, and the need to reverse deforestation and forest degradation is mentioned in option 2 of the draft texts for the mitigation work programme - after the global dialogue for this happened earlier this year, and forests were part of the theme. This could be a moment of great progress for the wider inclusion of nature, but it depends on the selection of option 2, as this is not at all mentioned in option 1 of the programme.

Forest conservation, Nature Based Solutions and ecosystems appear in option 2 of the draft texts of the UAE dialogue, providing the opportunity for another substantive outcome.

AT A GLANCE:

- Week 1 nature discussions focused on synergies between the 3 Rio conventions - the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), the UN Convention on Biological Diversity, (CBD) and the UN Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD)
- Parties expressed their support, and acknowledged the importance of synergies and cooperation, though there was a lot of disagreement on the timeline of these discussions.
- The Brazilian Presidency has proposed to continue the discussion of this matter in week.