

## Bonn Highlights: Thursday, 19 June 2025

Delegates were stretched thin across the various informal consultations that convened throughout the day. They addressed issues ranging from adaptation to mitigation, technology, and research. Progress was especially notable in discussions on the Adaptation Fund.

### Adaptation

**Review of the progress, effectiveness, and performance of the Adaptation Committee (AC):** In SB informal consultations, Co-Facilitators Geert Fremout (Belgium) and Lina Yassin (Sudan) noted that parties have not been able to conclude the review of the AC for several years due to long-standing disagreements over the roles of the Conference of the Parties (COP) and the Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement (CMA) therein. They invited views on an informal co-facilitators' background document outlining elements for a COP-only and COP-CMA approach.

Parties highlighted the crucial role of the AC and lamented the lack of progress in relation to its review. GRUPO SUR proposed the COP adopt a substantive decision regarding the review and the CMA take note of this decision. The AFRICAN GROUP, LIKE-MINDED DEVELOPING COUNTRIES (LMDCs), and LEAST DEVELOPED COUNTRIES (LDCs) opposed, saying that the COP is exclusively mandated with conducting the review. The EUROPEAN UNION (EU) pointed to compromise language used to resolve similar governance issues in relation to other constituted bodies.

Parties convened in huddles but were unable to find agreement. The co-facilitators will consult with the SB Chairs on the way forward.

**National Adaptation Plans:** In SBI informal consultations co-facilitated by Antwi-Boasiako Amoah (Ghana) and Oliver Gales (Australia), parties had a lengthy discussion on the way forward. The GROUP OF 77 AND CHINA (G-77/CHINA), opposed by the EU and the UNITED KINGDOM (UK), asked for the draft text from the 6th meeting of the CMA (CMA 6) to be projected on screen. After a huddle, the G-77/CHINA requested a conference room paper (CRP) with the original text and additional subheadings for clustering to be projected on screen. The EU requested more time to engage with the CRP before proceeding with substantive discussions.

### Mitigation

**Mitigation Work Programme (MWP):** In SB informal consultations co-facilitated by Ursula Fuentes Hutfilter (Germany) and Maesela John Kekana (South Africa), parties continued discussions on how to “make the MWP a safe space.”

Various countries highlighted the usefulness of the fifth global dialogue on forests and called for the Secretariat to finalize its report. BRAZIL, supported by NEW ZEALAND, proposed to recognize the role of Indigenous Peoples and the importance of fighting environmental crime leading to deforestation.

Countries disagreed on the MWP's role and function going forward. While some highlighted the success of the five dialogues convened to date and urged sticking to the MWP's mandate, others called for more substantive discussions addressing the implementation of nationally determined contributions (NDCs). The LDCs proposed convening a dialogue on the waste sector. INDIGENOUS PEOPLES ORGANIZATION emphasized territorial security and land rights as one of the most effective tools for mitigation.

The ENVIRONMENTAL INTEGRITY GROUP (EIG) raised various questions about the usefulness and added value of creating a digital platform and cautioned against discussing design features before fundamental questions have been addressed.

**Dialogue on Paris Agreement Article 6.2 (cooperative approaches):** On the second and final day of this mandated event, participants considered, among other things, how to ensure benefit sharing and fairness, and the most urgent capacity-building needs related to Article 6.2 implementation. The Secretariat highlighted the publication of the [Procedure for International Registry and Additional Registry Services](#). They explained that the international registry and the additional registry services will be integrated within one shared technical system, administered by the Secretariat, and accessible via the UNFCCC website. An interim manual solution will be available for parties to use pending completion of the international registry, which is expected by the end of 2026.

**Matters relating to the operation of the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM):** In SBSTA informal consultations, Co-Facilitators Kate Hancock (Australia) and Alick Muvundika (Zambia) introduced draft text. On timelines for the “CDM sunset,” the EU, the UK, the ALLIANCE OF SMALL ISLAND STATES (AOSIS), JAPAN, NORWAY, and NEW ZEALAND supported the earliest technically-feasible dates, while the LMDCs and AFRICAN GROUP preferred the latest possible dates. BRAZIL noted the Article 6 rules are now clear, and

acknowledged the time to conclude the CDM is approaching but reserved further comments.

Some parties also expressed views regarding the destination of leftover CDM Trust Fund resources, with the main options being: a transfer to the Adaptation Fund; support for Article 6-related issues; capacity building; or a combination of these.

The co-facilitators will revise the draft text.

### **Finance**

**Matters relating to the Adaptation Fund:** In SBI informal consultations Co-Facilitators Claire Holzer Fleming (United Kingdom) and Isatou Camara (The Gambia) invited parties' views on: membership of the Fund's Board; the Fund's fifth review; and arrangements for the Fund to exclusively serve the Paris Agreement. The EIG announced withdrawing the group's past proposal to change the Board's composition.

The EIG, EU, and the LDCs called for updating the Board's terminology to refer to developed and developing countries, rather than Annex I and non-Annex I countries. The ARAB GROUP did not consider terminology changes necessary or legally relevant. The INDEPENDENT ALLIANCE OF LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN (AILAC) indicated the timing of the change in terminology could be determined in future.

Parties converged on using the terms of reference of the previous review for the fifth review, but diverged on its timing. The EIG, ARAB GROUP, and AFRICAN GROUP proposed waiting until the transition to the Paris Agreement has been finalized to conduct the review, while the LDCs and AOSIS preferred not to wait.

Parties converged around the need to put in place the Trustee arrangements as soon as possible and sought the Secretariat's guidance on the legal requirements for the transition. The AFRICAN GROUP emphasized terminating the arrangements between the World Bank, as Trustee of the Fund, and the Conference of the Parties Serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol. They suggested that the CMA instruct the Board to enter into a new legal agreement with the World Bank.

The co-facilitators will prepare an informal note.

### **Technology**

**Review of the Functions of the Climate Technology Centre:** SBI informal consultations were co-facilitated by Pemy Gasela (South Africa) and Stig Svenningsen (Norway), who pointed to draft text. At the outset, the Climate Technology Centre and Network (CTCN) gave an overview of its work to date, highlighting it has completed over 100 capacity-building requests on a "modest budget." Responding to parties' questions, the CTCN pointed to a lack of capacity to conduct post-technical assistance work and the USD 250,000 cap per request as key constraints. The LDCs and the AFRICAN GROUP called for enhancing the CTCN's mandate as the "implementation arm" of the Technology Mechanism.

**Technology Implementation Programme (TIP):** In SBI informal consultations co-facilitated by Elfriede More (Austria) and Omar Alcock (Jamaica), parties continued discussions on the basis of draft text prepared at CMA 6. CANADA, supported by the UK and JAPAN but opposed by CHINA, highlighted that the TIP should respond to the outcomes of the Global Stocktake (GST). The ARAB GROUP underscored that the TIP is not the

space to discuss energy matters or the economics of specific technologies.

Noting fundamental disagreements, the UK, opposed by the EU, enjoined parties to focus discussions on the scope of the TIP. Expressing disappointment with the slow pace of progress, CHILE cautioned against repeating the experiences with the MWP and objected to singling out specific paragraphs of the GST decision. CHINA suggested developing a technology goal with specific indicators.

The co-facilitators will revise the draft text.

### **Global Stocktake**

**Dialogue on implementing the Global Stocktake outcomes, referred to in paragraph 97 of decision 1/CMA.5:** In SBI informal consultations co-facilitated by Ricardo Marshall (Barbados), parties continued discussing the way forward. Some parties, including NORWAY and the UK, supported using as a basis of negotiations the draft text from CMA 6, especially the section on modalities, while the ARAB GROUP called for using both the CMA 6 text and previous iterations to inform further discussions.

Several parties highlighted fundamental differences of opinion, and noted some of the suggestions being made backtrack from progress achieved at CMA 6. The RUSSIAN FEDERATION, INDIA, and others stressed the dialogue's purpose is not to assess Paris Agreement implementation but to consider how implementation needs can be supported.

The co-facilitators will prepare an informal note.

**Procedural and logistical elements of the GST:** In SB informal consultations co-facilitated by Kishan Kumarsingh (Trinidad and Tobago), AUSTRALIA reported that discussions in informal informals had focused on language related to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and that parties need more time to engage on bridging proposals.

TÜRKIYE opposed referencing a GST follow-up and stressed there should be no overlap between the technical and political phases of the process. AOSIS and AILAC proposed a standalone consideration of loss and damage, and the MOUNTAIN PARTNERSHIP proposed mountains as a thematic focus. Many parties, including the AFRICAN GROUP, EIG, MALAYSIA, CHINA, and others, preferred retaining the scope agreed at CMA 1, while allowing consideration of emerging issues.

Discussions will continue in informal informals.

### **Other Issues**

**Provision of Financial and Technical Support to Developing Countries for Reporting and Capacity Building under the Paris Agreement:** Parties welcomed the work of the Secretariat on this matter. The G-77/CHINA called for more time for in-depth discussions in mandated events, especially to address problem solving with the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and its Implementing Agencies, underscoring this fell short at SB 62.

As textual elements for a CMA decision, the AFRICAN GROUP proposed a call for parties to provide submissions after the second biennial transparency reports and a workshop to exchange experiences. They suggested clarifying, under this item, gaps in GEF support and liaising with finance negotiators to reflect on the type of GEF guidance that would help address these. The AFRICAN GROUP and LMDCs highlighted linkages with the revision of the Enhanced Transparency Framework's modalities,

procedures, and guidelines in 2028. The LMDCs suggested simplifying approval processes for accessing reporting support, with AILAC suggesting standards for and enhanced coordination among the GEF Implementing Agencies that provide transparency support.

The co-facilitators invited written input to inform the preparation of an informal note.

**Just Transition Work Programme (JTWP):** In the SB contact group, Co-Chairs Federica Fricano (Italy) and Joseph Teo (Singapore) invited parties' input on issue clusters displayed on-screen. As elements to contextualize the JTWP, parties suggested language on, among others: the facilitative nature of the JTWP; international cooperation and the importance of means of implementation; trade-restrictive unilateral measures; 1.5°C-aligned pathways; and human rights, and Indigenous Peoples as rights holders.

On key messages emerging from the dialogues held under the JTWP, parties highlighted, among others:

- the importance of facilitating access to energy and clean cooking;
- challenges related to limited access to technology and finance;
- the right to development;
- the impact of unilateral measures and trade barriers on countries' economies;
- importance of social dialogue, stakeholder engagement, and labor rights;
- just transition pathways as nationally determined and bottom up;
- challenges of transitioning away from fossil fuels and the need to focus on low-carbon development;
- the role of critical minerals;
- consideration of internally-displaced persons and the most vulnerable; and
- the rights of Indigenous Peoples, including those in voluntary isolation and with no contact.

Informal consultations will continue.

**Response Measures:** SB informal consultations were co-facilitated by Annela Anger-Kraavi (Estonia). Referring to the compromise reached on the agenda, the G-77/CHINA proposed including unilateral trade measures to be included as a fifth priority area for the Forum on the Impact of the Implementation of Response Measures and the Katowice Committee of Experts on the Impacts of the Implementation of Response Measures (KCI). The EU opposed.

There were also disagreements about the mandate provided in paragraph 7 of Decision 16/CP.29 (setting out the Forum's consideration of matters relating to the KCI). CANADA, supported by the UK, stressed the need to wait for the KCI's annual report before considering further issues to be incorporated into the workplan. The G-77/CHINA differed, saying that the Forum, as the political body, could provide guidance at any time.

Parties will meet informally before the next informal consultations.

**Research and Systematic Observation:** In SBSTA informal consultations co-facilitated by Patricia Nying'uro (Kenya) and Frank McGovern (Ireland), parties proposed edits to the co-facilitators' informal note. Opposing language on "1.5°C-aligned pathways," SAUDI ARABIA suggested referring to "climate action," while INDIA proposed "pathways aligned with

sustainable development and poverty eradication." Various countries called for noting "with great concern" the information provided by the World Meteorological Organization about the state of the climate system. KENYA urged a greater focus on adaptation and underscored the importance of involving Indigenous scientists in translating Indigenous knowledge into "Western scientific ways of thinking."

Several delegates asked for clarification about the proposal to request the SBSTA Chair to prepare a report, following the conclusion of each IPCC assessment cycle, on how gaps identified by the SBSTA during its sessions are being addressed by the scientific community. CHILE replied that this would provide a cost-effective way of tracking progress made towards closing knowledge gaps.

The co-facilitators will revise the text.

**Arrangements for Intergovernmental Meetings:** In a contact group, co-chaired by Laurence Ahoussou (Canada) and Kristina Stege (Marshall Islands), the Secretariat reported on options for increasing the efficiency of the UNFCCC process ([FCCC/SB/2025/INF.6](#)). Parties all agreed this is crucial, but diverged on how to go about it. The ARAB GROUP, AFRICAN GROUP, CHINA, and INDIA considered several options not in conformity with the draft rules of procedure, especially with regard to an increased role for the presiding officers and the Bureau. The EIG suggested capping party delegations at 200 representatives; and requiring that items proposed for inclusion on the negotiations agenda be submitted by at least 30 parties from two regional groups. INDIA emphasized parties' prerogative to propose agenda items. The LDCs called for an LDC seat on the Bureau and urged Presidencies' restraint in holding ministerial consultations and issuing declarations.

Parties diverged on: clustering agenda items; multiyear and thematic programming; and the possibility to sunset the consideration of issues, such as those related to the Kyoto Protocol. They highlighted the importance of making cost-informed decisions with regard to mandating events. Several delegations also called for addressing the soaring prices of accommodations, pavilions, and delegation offices.

The co-chairs invited informal engagement among parties.

### *In the Corridors*

Logistical issues were high on delegates' minds as jammed rooms in Bonn and worries over shortages in affordable accommodation at the upcoming Belém meeting once again fomented debates over the climate regime's carrying capacity. The Brazilian Presidency attempted to alleviate concerns by offering delegates a chance to dock boats near the venue. "Now I just need to get my yacht to Brazil," joked one observer, leaving the logistics briefing with mixed feelings.

While frustration is growing over the "toothless and deadlocked" mitigation work programme, parties are keen to avert a similar fate for the embryonic technology implementation programme. "This is our best chance to move from pledges to implementation," underscored a delegate. Still, the response to the energy transition called for in the Global Stocktake decision remains a sticking point. Looking at the nationally determined contributions due in 2025, the Alliance of Small Island States challenged everyone to demonstrate their 1.5°C-alignment: "We cannot afford to wait for the next round."

## Follow daily coverage and photos of the 2025 Bonn Climate Change Conference



[enb.iisd.org](https://enb.iisd.org)



subscribe at [bit.ly/enbupdate](https://bit.ly/enbupdate)



[@enb.iisd.org](https://twitter.com/enb.iisd.org)



[/earth-negotiations-bulletin](https://www.linkedin.com/company/earth-negotiations-bulletin)

