



No to imposing national mitigation targets

Belém, Nov 17 (Radhika Chatterjee) - Discussions on the 'Sharm-el-Sheikh mitigation ambition and implementation work programme' [commonly referred to as the 'Mitigation Work Programme' (MWP)] at the on-going climate talks in Belém, Brazil, saw many developing countries saying that work under the programme occurs within its mandate and should not be used to impose national mitigation targets. They also said that it should not undermine the nationally determined nature of each country's contributions to climate action and also highlighted the importance of means of implementation in raising their ambition.

The **Like-minded developing countries [LMDC]** also pointed out that the UNFCCC's Synthesis Report of the biennial communications from Parties [i.e. the Biennial Transparency Reports-BTRs] showed that none of the Annex I Parties [developed countries] are on track to reduce their greenhouse gas emission [GHG] targets of 2030, emphasising that developed countries are not taking the lead in mitigation efforts.

The **Arab Group** in response to interventions by some Parties on keeping the 1.5 °C goal within reach, referred to the [decision](#) made under the agenda on 'Research and Systematic Observation' at the last session of the Subsidiary Bodies in June

[SB62], that noted that "The multi-decadal estimates of current global warming are between 1.34 and 1.41 °C". The group added that "given the uncertainty ranges, the possibility that we have already exceeded 1.5 °C cannot be ruled out." It wanted this to be reflected in the MWP decision in Belém. [See further details below on the interventions of Parties.]

The first week of the talks which began on Nov. 11, showed strong divergences in the following areas: the manner in which the MWP decision takes into account the findings of the global dialogues as contained in the annual report of the MWP; whether there should be any linkage between the MWP and the global stocktake [GST] decision adopted in Dubai at COP 28; whether the MWP should be a vehicle for implementation of the mitigation section of the GST outcome; the relationship of the MWP and the nationally determined contributions [NDCs]; whether to have any further follow up discussions and actions on the digital platform for MWP or not; and how to address the issue of continuation of the work programme. The importance of means of implementation as a crucial element of raising mitigation ambition and implementation was also highlighted.

[The MWP decision adopted in 2022 prior to

the GST outcome, states that *“the work programme shall be operationalized through focused exchanges of views, information and ideas, noting that the outcomes of the work programme will be non-prescriptive, non-punitive, facilitative, respectful of national sovereignty and national circumstances, take into account the nationally determined nature of NDCs and will not impose new targets or goals”*. The MWP is supposed to continue its work till 2026, before the adoption of a decision on further extension of the work.]

The informal consultations on the MWP under the UNFCCC’s Subsidiary Bodies [SBs] were co-facilitated by **Ursula Fuentes (Germany)** and **Maesela John Kekana (South Africa)**, with Parties being requested to share their views on three questions: what concrete improvements to MWP they would like to see and how should the digital platform be considered?; what would be the key outcomes of the fifth and sixth global dialogues taking into account the annual report and how they should be framed and views on the continuation of the work programme. After five days of informal consultations, Parties agreed to forward the [informal note](#) to the CMA [meeting of the Paris Agreement] for further consideration of the matter.

Several developing countries including the **LMDC**, the **African Group**, the **Arab Group**, **Egypt**, **Algeria** and **South Africa** stressed that the MWP should not be used to impose any targets on countries while taking into consideration the findings of the fifth and sixth global dialogues, as the objective of the programme was to facilitate dialogues and exchange views, to provide an opportunity for Parties to share experiences and learn from each other. They further argued that any kind of imposition of new mitigation targets on developing countries through the inclusion of key messages would result in going beyond the mandate of the MWP and add a burden on developing countries. They emphasized the importance of means of implementation in scaling up mitigation ambition.

They also said that the focus of the MWP should rather be on further improving the global dialogues which are mitigation-related and the investment focused events held under the programme, to

ensure that Parties are able to make the most out of the dialogues conducted. They emphasized the need for building on the discussions that Parties had on the digital platform as a “hub” at the sessions held in Bonn in June 2025 (see [TWN update](#) for details), and supported the idea of launching a mitigation platform using the mitigation component of the Non-Market Approaches (NMA) platform under Article 6.8 of the Paris Agreement [PA]. Stressing the importance of means of implementation in scaling up mitigation ambition, they said there is a need for mapping existing international financial institutions that provide climate finance including multilateral development banks, regional development banks, bilateral financing agencies with a view to host those institutions later on the platform. They also highlighted the need for increased cooperation between the MWP and UNFCCC’s Financial Mechanism and Technology Mechanism to ensure greater provision of financing for projects and assessment of technology needs identified through the MWP.

[The fifth and sixth global dialogues this year under the MWP focused on the topic “enabling mitigation solutions in the forest sector, drawing on national and regional experience”, and “enabling mitigation solutions in the waste sector, including through circular economy approaches” respectively. The secretariat prepared an annual report on the global dialogues and investment focused events held in 2025.]

Developed countries and some developing countries especially the **Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS)**, and the **Independent Alliance of Latin American and the Caribbean (AILAC)** on the other hand, insisted on having strong outcomes from the MWP by scaling up mitigation ambition keeping in mind the “urgency” of the situation. This they said was to be done through the insertion of key messages under the MWP in the CMA decision. Some of the key elements they emphasised for these messages are: having mitigation action aligned with the 1.5 °C goal, creating a strong linkage between the MWP and the GST referring to paragraph 186 of the Dubai GST decision; scaling up mitigation action in line with paragraphs 28 [on energy and fossil fuels] and 33 [addressing deforestation and forest degradation] of the GST decision; and using the MWP to align NDCs with the

outcomes of the first GST.

[Para 186 of the GST decision from Dubai states: “Invites the relevant work programmes and constituted bodies under or serving the Paris Agreement to integrate relevant outcomes of the first global stocktake in planning their future work, in line with their mandates.]

China for LMDC said the MWP decision should be achieved in a “facilitative, participative, non-prescriptive” manner and stressed the need for highlighting the principle of common but differentiated responsibility and respective capabilities (CBDR-RC), in light of different national circumstances. It said “technology support should be provided to increase ambition and implementation” in mitigation and the UNFCCC’s Financial Mechanism should be invited to ensure greater coherence between the work of MWP and Global Environment Facility [GEF] and Green Climate Fund [GCF]. It suggested the need for further optimization of the proposed digital platform with a clearer definition, to address concerns raised by others about the duplication of work.

Stressing the fact that solutions identified under the MWP cannot be imposed in a one size fits all approach, China proposed to take note of the annual report of the global dialogues in a “concise paragraph” that notes the key findings, opportunities and barriers identified in the dialogues “instead of reflecting detailed messages.” It pointed out that messages would vary depending on the region and context and cannot be singled out and imposed in a top down manner. Adding further, it said the MWP’s mandate “does not mean to force Parties to enhance mitigation targets” and be used for imposing mitigation targets on developing countries. On the issue of considering the continuation of the work programme in this year’s decision, it said addressing that before 2026 would amount to going beyond MWP’s mandate. Referring to the BTR Synthesis Report, it added that “Annex I Parties are not taking the lead on mitigation action” and asked “we don’t understand their eagerness in discussing the continuation of this programme.”

Saudi Arabia for Arab Group said “the MWP must remain faithful to its mandate focused on

information exchange and ideas in a non-prescriptive, facilitative, non-punitive manner... taking into account the nationally determined nature” of mitigation actions. It rejected any linkages between the GST and the MWP, and said that the “GST has its own dedicated agenda”, adding that “revisiting the GST within MWP is outside MWP’s mandate”. It said prescriptive messages violate the MWP’s mandate and the bottom-up nature of the PA. On the issue of aligning NDCs with the GST outcome, it said NDCs are not mitigation specific and have elements related to adaptation as well. Responding to the interventions made by some Parties for keeping the 1.5 °C goal within reach, it suggested for the inclusion of the language in the MWP text from the [decision](#) made under Research and Systematic Observation at SB62, according to which “the multi-decadal estimates of current global warming are between 1.34 and 1.41 °C, and given the uncertainty ranges, the possibility that we have already exceeded 1.5 °C cannot be ruled out.”

On the digital platform, it said it could be linked to the Non-Market Approaches (NMA) Platform under Article 6.8 of the PA, adding that improvements to the MWP must remain within the scope of its mandate. Emphasizing the importance of means of implementation, it said financiers and investors should be invited to the Investment Focused Events (IFE) to “ensure meaningful progress”. It said IFEs “should be held in conjunction with global investment forums rather than limiting them to the global dialogues” so that “organized structured matchmaking between projects and financiers” could occur.

On the outcomes of the fifth and sixth global dialogues, it said the group “can take note of the report, but cannot cherry pick solutions”, that are not applicable to every national or regional contexts. It said the next year’s dialogue should focus on industry and address barriers faced in the sector. It also asked for the need to address impacts of mitigation action on developing countries and emphasized on the need for minimizing negative impacts keeping in mind equity considerations. Stressing the need for highlighting the principles of equity and CBDR, it said developed countries must continue to take the lead in mitigation and provide the means of implementation for developing countries and pointed out the different starting

points of developing and developed countries.

Zimbabwe for **Africa Group** said the “presentations and views shared by Parties during the global dialogues were not exhaustive” and the “annual report is not fully reflective of Parties’ views”. It said the IFEs and pitch hubs “have not borne the fruit they were intended for” and found it “regrettable that they remain advisory in nature” and are “not bringing any new financing in the form of grants and concessional loans despite proposals from the African Group. On the digital platform, it said, “we still need to agree on its purpose and objective”, and expressed a preference for the mitigation platform to be hosted under NMA platform under Article 6.8 of the PA. On the issue of how messages from the annual report are considered in the decision, it said messages “should not be prescriptive”. It said “forestry is not just a mitigation issue. For the African Group, forests are an issue of sustainable development, livelihoods” and that it wants to ensure “nature-based solutions for the forestry sector should not be discussed on the basis of mitigation” only. Citing paragraph 2 of decision 4/CMA.4, it said it “did not envisage any discussions” about the continuation of the work programme at COP30.

India said that “the MWP is non-prescriptive, non-punitive, facilitative, and respectful of national sovereignty and national circumstances.” It said the MWP’s work should now focus on “implementation support and bridging gaps in access to those enablers, disabling the dis-enablers,” adding that the “Technology Mechanism can facilitate the implementation of MWP” and the Financial Mechanism should be used to support the work of MWP. It said the digital platform can be coalesced with the digital platform of Article 6.8 of the PA and the platform can be “a facilitative tool.” On the outcomes of the fifth and sixth global dialogues, it said, “these dialogues have demonstrated that there is no single pathway to mitigation. Parties value exchanges that help identify enablers such as finance, technology, and capacity, rather than prescriptive models. Parties are capable of drawing from the reports and experiences to design domestic approaches that reflect their national circumstances, development priorities and capacities. The MWP must remain facilitative, non-prescriptive, and grounded in equity and national ownership.” It called the

proposal of drawing linkages between forests and the food sector made by Australia “highly problematic”, adding that “higher reliance on forests as emissions sinks, especially as carbon markets, will have negative impacts on food security.”

It said GST and MWP had different mandates and it could not accept any linkages between the two. Given the nationally determined nature of NDCs, it said it was up to the Parties to see how they would like to use the GST decision to inform their NDCs instead of imposing in a top down manner any kind of alignment between the GST outcome and NDCs.

On continuation of the MWP it said, “the current mandate runs until 2026, and any discussion on further continuation at this point may be premature. Any proposal for continuation or expansion beyond the agreed timeline would require a clear rationale, Party consensus, and a formal decision by the CMA. Our priority now should be to strengthen the quality, inclusivity, and Party-ownership of the ongoing process — not to reopen its scope or timeline.” Responding to the comparison made by some developed countries between MWP and the just transition work programme (JTWP) in the context of continuation of MWP’s work, it said discussions in JTWP are focused on an actionable outcome and “not a review of the JTWP” and pointed out that in those discussions developing countries were “being told that we cannot have a discussion even on an actionable outcome” nor on a review of the work programme.

Egypt said “the ultimate objective of the MWP is to help Parties achieve reductions in GHGs emissions according to their national circumstances and respecting their national sovereignty. It is not meant to infringe on national sovereignty or tell Parties what to do.” It said “the MWP needs to cooperate with the Financial Mechanism of the PA. Any identified project from the work under the MWP specifically from the pitch hub should find its way for easy access to the Financial Mechanism.” Adding further, it said, “the MWP needs to cooperate with the Technology Mechanism. The MWP should ask the Technology Mechanism to study and evaluate opportunities identified under the MWP and inform Parties on the outcomes of such evaluation. Such evaluation and information

would be useful for parties when designing their NDCs based on their own national circumstances and in a manner that respects their national sovereignty.”

Calling the digital platform a facilitative tool for matchmaking and taking into account concerns of raised by other Parties about the possible duplication of work in the digital platform, it said “the best alternative is to utilize the mitigation component under Article 6.8 platform. This is a platform which is already available, and agreed upon by all Parties, and will not consume time and resources to establish. On the manner in which messages from the annual report of MWP should be taken into account in the decision, it offered two alternatives of “either having policy neutral messages that are not prescriptive” with caveats added for stressing the importance of no-one-size-fits all approach, or “only taking note of the report”.

South Africa shared similar views and said that “one common denominator is the lack of finance for ambitious implementation.” It said it “would like MWP to lead to implementation of finance for projects at national and regional level” and emphasized the need for IFEs and pitch hubs to “lead to the provision of finance.”

Bangladesh for the **Least Developed Countries [LDCs]** said there was a need for promoting integrated approaches to address biodiversity, livelihoods and sustainable development. Recognizing the complementarity and co-benefit between adaptation and mitigation, it asked for the inclusion of messages on sustainable management of forests to ensure finance reaches the sector. It said messages on the waste sector from the annual report should promote the reduction of methane and circular economy approaches among other things. On digital platform, it said “we support targeted approaches aligned with national priorities” and that it was “trying to get convinced about creation of digital platform.” It also pointed out that the Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMA) registry was not successful in this context and added that “it should not take several years for the creation of new online tools.” It asked for accelerating the implementation of NDCs and “overcome structural barriers, limited capacity, high transaction costs, and risk premiums.” It said de-risking and technical assistance through MWP

would “ensure country ownership and direct access”. It said submissions should be invited from Parties to address questions like where to have the review for continuation of MWP after 2026 and when is the appropriate time for this review in June next year.

Samoa for **AOSIS** said there is a need for strengthening collective ambition and implementation of mitigation efforts. It asked to reaffirm “urgency to scale up mitigation ambition to keep 1.5 °C within reach” and mention Article 2.1 of the PA in the preambular section of the decision. It emphasized the “vital role of forests” in mitigation and asked for halting and reversing deforestation by 2030. It asked to link paragraphs 28 and 33 of the GST outcome with MWP for keeping 1.5 within reach. For improving the work programme it said there is a need for delivering “actionable solutions” and “greater integration with GST, not to duplicate, but for complementarity.” It did not see “how this digital platform would be different from other platforms such as the NAMA.” It said “any decisions on the digital platform should take place outside MWP.” It said “the current MWP will not deliver its objective” and emphasized the “need to improve it”. It supported the call for inviting submissions from Parties for considering their views on the continuation of the work programme.

Colombia for **AILAC** said there is a need for “enhancing mitigation ambition and implementation in this critical decade.” It said “after years of operation, MWP has failed to deliver outcomes” and called for accelerating “solutions for emissions reduction”. Adding further, it said “MWP must evolve into a dedicated action oriented space to achieve GHG reductions by 2030 consistent with the PA temperature goal.” It also said the “MWP must be aligned with outcomes of GST.” It mentioned paragraph 28 of the GST outcome and pointed to the need for “scaling up ambition and implementation across sectors.” It said the global dialogues of MWP “should lead to clear messages that Parties can integrate in their NDCs” and asked for aligning GST and NDC cycles. It asked for scaling up climate finance and direct access to means of implementation. It said the discussions on the digital platform “divert attention away from the mandate of this work programme” and said it “will fit better under the

action agenda.” It said the discussion of continuation of MWP needs to be informed by “a review for its effectiveness.”

Switzerland for the **Environment Integrity Group (EIG)** said Parties should make an “important contribution to the first COP in the Amazon” by reflecting messages on deforestation in MWP. It asked for a “substantive outcome on scaling up mitigation ambition and implementation” and said outcomes of the fifth and sixth global dialogues should be reflected in MWP’s decision. It said forests are crucial in mitigation and adaptation and mentioned the role of nature-based solutions in adaptation. In this context it also mentioned REDD+, payments for ecosystem based services for directing finance towards the forest sector. It emphasized the need for enhanced effort to achieve halting and reversing deforestation. It did not see the digital platform as the main part of the MWP. It said the platform under Article 6.8 of the PA “is not a matchmaking platform” but an “information sharing platform.” It said there is a need for a “broader reflection on how the process [of continuation of MWP] works” and “strengthen critical learning” and work on a “sectoral basis.”

Australia said this year’s annual report of MWP has “strong substantive messages on forests.” It said key messages in the MWP decision should have “a solutions oriented approach.” It highlighting the role of forest ecosystems in global emission reduction efforts as carbon sinks and asked for the need to address underlying drivers of deforestation in a fair and equitable manner. It mentioned the need for having synergies between the Rio Conventions. It also stressed the importance of “robust measurement, reporting and verification (MRV) systems database building” and the need for international support for this. It mentioned “climate finance, carbon markets, public private partnerships and other important tools for derisking investments” as important sources of finance for mitigation actions in the forest sector. Highlighting the importance of international cooperation and means of implementation, it said specific suggestions like “carbon markets, REDD+” and simplified access of finance to Indigenous Peoples could be included in the decision. It said it would like to make the key

messages in the MWP decision “actionable” and that links may be specified between agriculture and forestry, among other things. It also mentioned “sustainable management of forests” and “agroecology products” in this context.

It called the digital platform an “interesting idea” and said it was “not clear on how the [Article 6.8 platform] would work” and pointed out that “active discussions were happening in that room.” It said it would be a good idea discuss this idea further along with the review of MWP next year. It supported calls for submissions inviting views on continuation of MWP in 2026, a synthesis of which would be considered at SB64.

The **European Union** said there is a need “for a more effective MWP” and to stress “urgency” of action in the preamble. It said it wanted to include a reference to the GST outcome, particularly its paragraph 33 and 186, in the MWP decision. It said key messages in the MWP decision should have a “social dimension” in the circular economy. On continuation of the work programme, it said, “we don’t want to force a decision here. We just want to create the time to reflect on how we can make MWP more effective in the next five years.” It said it noticed “similarities and differences between MWP and JTWP” and mentioned that some Parties “are very strict on the mandate in MWP, but are creative with JTWP’s mandate.” Adding further, it said, “we need actionable outcomes in MWP.” On the digital platform it said, “after all the additional information we got on the digital platform, we don’t see any added value” and that no “more discussion is required on that”.

The **United Kingdom** said it was looking “for specific improvements to the global dialogues and IFEs.” It expressed the need for including detailed messages from MWP’s annual report in the decision framing them within national and regional contexts. It said that “domestic action can be taken.” It said it needed guidance from colleagues who work on Article 6.8 issues to consider what a mitigation platform under the 6.8 platform would look like. On the continuation of the work programme, it said “We would like to see some language here.”