

## Bonn Highlights: Wednesday, 25 June 2025

Delegates were in a rush to wrap up negotiations on the penultimate day of the meeting. While they reached agreement on some issues, such as gender and the Adaptation Fund, other discussions are still ongoing, including on just transition.

### Adaptation

**Global Goal on Adaptation (GGA):** In SB informal consultations, Co-Facilitators Tina Kobilšek (Slovenia) and Zita Wilks (Gabon) noted progress during informal discussions the night before, in particular on the guidance relating to indicators, and invited parties to continue deliberations.

The AFRICAN GROUP, supported by the ARAB GROUP and opposed by the EUROPEAN UNION (EU), urged indicator alignment with Paris Agreement Article 7.1 (GGA) and Article 2 (temperature goal).

On cross-cutting considerations, the AFRICAN GROUP, supported by the ARAB GROUP and the LIKE-MINDED DEVELOPING COUNTRIES (LMDCs), proposed deleting the entire paragraph, noting such considerations have already been inserted elsewhere in the text. The EU, GRUPO SUR, and the ENVIRONMENTAL INTEGRITY GROUP (EIG) opposed. Various parties and observers called for explicit references to specific vulnerable groups, with NORWAY and TÜRKIYE pointing to children and youth, GRUPO SUR to people of African descent, and observers emphasizing persons with disabilities. COLOMBIA called for Indigenous Peoples and local communities to be included in the peer review of indicators. INDIA suggested a generic reference to “vulnerable people and populations.” The AFRICAN GROUP reiterated that cross-cutting considerations will only reduce vulnerabilities if paired with adequate means of implementation (MoI).

On the inclusion of MoI in guidance for the refinement of indicators, CANADA, supported by the UK, proposed a new text option referring to “incentives,” “enabling conditions,” and “all sources of finance.” The GROUP OF 77 AND CHINA (G-77/CHINA) opposed, reiterating its call for referencing MoI indicators in line with Paris Agreement Articles 9, 10, and 11, acknowledging developing countries’ needs and gaps in relation to the access and quality of adaptation finance. The ARAB GROUP, supported by the LMDCs and the LEAST DEVELOPED COUNTRIES (LDCs), expressed frustration over returning to sections of the text already discussed in informal informals the

night before. The LDCs noted they were baffled by the last minute efforts to “change the narrative,” while the AFRICAN GROUP said it found the latest proposals “disturbing.” AUSTRALIA urged parties to reiterate previously agreed language and to omit politically sensitive guidance at this technical stage. The LDCs responded that the experts were asking for such guidance, and that the compromise reached in Baku included providing further guidance on MoI.

On the way forward, parties converged on the need for streamlined text in relation to the guidance on indicators. The EU, supported by various developed countries, proposed to delete text on the Baku Adaptation Roadmap, transformational adaptation, and elements of a draft decision, saying parties had not discussed these sections in sufficient depth. The G-77/CHINA opposed, preferring to retain all options in these sections and forward them in the form of draft decision text to SB 63. As a compromise, the EU, supported by AUSTRALIA, suggested capturing progress on the sections in question in an informal note with a disclaimer attesting to its informal status.

Eventually, parties agreed to task the co-facilitators with elaborating streamlined text on the indicator guidance while leaving the other sections unchanged, and, at the EU’s request, communicate to the SB Chairs that the new text contains different iterations.

**Guidance relating to Adaptation Communications:** In SBI informal consultations, Co-Facilitator Thomas Lerenten Lelekoiten (Kenya) introduced draft CMA decision text. Most parties supported moving forward with the text.

The ARAB GROUP and AFRICAN GROUP, opposed by GRUPO SUR and the INDEPENDENT ALLIANCE OF LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN (AILAC), proposed deleting the paragraph inviting SBI 64 to consider inviting the Adaptation Committee to prepare recommendations to inform the guidance’s possible revision. The co-facilitators pointed to the preambular reference to Decision 2/CMA.5 (GGA), which contains a broader mandate for the Adaptation Committee, and suggested this preambular reference covers the invitation in the disputed paragraph, with the AFRICAN GROUP concurring.

After additional discussions, GRUPO SUR and AILAC, noting their “great compromise,” accepted deletion of the paragraph.

**Review of the progress, effectiveness, and performance of the Adaptation Committee:** In SB informal consultations, Co-Facilitator Geert Fremout (Belgium) invited views on draft conclusions.

Debates centered on a paragraph recalling various decisions. The AFRICAN GROUP, supported by the ARAB GROUP and the LMDCs, sought to delete the reference to decision 10/CMA.4, stressing that only decisions that speak to the mandate of the review should be recalled.

CANADA, supported by AUSTRALIA, the EU and JAPAN, indicated their willingness to go forward with the draft conclusions as presented, with or without the deletion of the paragraph citing the decisions, with the EU opposing “selective deletions”, and JAPAN stressing the COP and CMA should be “equally engaged in the review.”

The ARAB GROUP, supported by the LMDCs, stressed the need for clear language that the review would be undertaken by the COP so that parties can focus on substance rather than governance, opposed by AUSTRALIA who cautioned that “attempts at a quick fix ignore the history of this subject.” The AFRICAN GROUP, LMDCs, and ARAB GROUP indicated their willingness to draft language.

The co-facilitators will consult with the SB Chairs on the way forward.

### **Mitigation**

**Mitigation Work Programme (MWP):** In SB informal consultations, Co-Facilitators Ursula Fuentes Hutfilter (Germany) and Maesela John Kekana (South Africa) introduced an informal note containing section headings and a bulleted list of placeholder text. They invited parties’ views on: the informal note, seeking parties’ agreement to forward the text to Belém; and suggestions to undertake intersessional work on the digital platform.

Most parties supported forwarding the informal note to Belém, but with amendments. The LMDCs, supported by the ARAB GROUP, proposed deletion of all bullet points, leaving only the section headings. The ALLIANCE OF SMALL ISLAND STATES (AOSIS) supported reference to “the latest science,” JAPAN proposed “best available science” and the RUSSIAN FEDERATION opposed any reference to science in the preamble. The LDCs and AUSTRALIA called for reference to the synthesis report on nationally determined contributions (NDCs).

The AFRICAN GROUP suggested deleting reference to intersessional work and replacing it with a call for submissions, and proposed changing “improvements to the implementation of the MWP” to “improvements to the MWP.” AILAC said improvements should not be limited to the organization of the dialogues and investment-focused events, but should extend to the effectiveness of the MWP and its modalities. JAPAN suggested changing this to “review and improvements.”

On continuation of the work programme, AILAC, AOSIS, AUSTRALIA, and the LDCs opposed deletion of this section, acknowledging that although a decision will only be taken in 2026, discussions can start now. They supported calling for submissions of views.

On the digital platform, AILAC, AOSIS, the UK, EIG, EU, NORWAY, REPUBLIC OF KOREA, NEW ZEALAND, and AUSTRALIA noted lack of consensus on this. They opposed intersessional work on the platform and preferred deleting a reference in the informal note to “advancement of the digital platform.” They proposed alternatives, such as discussing the digital platform under the action agenda, a Brazilian Presidency

initiative, side events, or a separate agenda item, but not under the MWP agenda item. EGYPT and the RUSSIAN FEDERATION opposed these suggestions.

The co-facilitators will revise the informal note. The LMDCs suggested, and other parties agreed, that the revised text should only include the structure/headings, with no bullet points.

### **Finance**

**Matters relating to the Adaptation Fund:** In SBI informal consultations, Co-Facilitator Claire Holzer Fleming (United Kingdom) introduced a revised informal note, capturing insertions made during the previous session, and procedural conclusions for discussions to continue at SBI 63 on the basis of this note.

The G-77/CHINA said it submitted a conference room paper (CRP), which is identical to the co-facilitators’ informal note in terms of substance but has the elements for draft decisions split into three annexes, and called for the CRP to be linked in a footnote to the draft SBI conclusions. The ARAB GROUP suggested the draft SBI conclusions specify that discussions will continue on the basis of “the work conducted at SBI 62,” with a footnote linking to both the co-facilitators’ informal note and the CRP. The EU emphasized its understanding that nothing prejudices the structure of decisions to be adopted in Belém.

Parties agreed to the procedural conclusions, linking to both documents.

### **Technology**

**Review of the Functions of the Climate Technology Centre (CTC):** SBI informal consultations were co-facilitated by Pemy Gasela (South Africa). PAPUA NEW GUINEA reported back from unsuccessful consultations in informal informals held the previous evening: “The more we negotiated, the further apart we got.”

The co-facilitator introduced draft procedural conclusions. Noting outstanding disagreement on the updated functions of the CTC, the EU proposed: concluding the CTC’s review, acknowledging the CMA’s participation therein; extending the CTC’s term; and confirming its current functions. PAPUA NEW GUINEA opposed, pointing to the inadequacy of the current functions. The UK proposed having two separate agenda items on the CTC’s functions and the host selection criteria, respectively.

Underlining the urgency of progress on the CTC, AILAC expressed concern about the “deprioritization” of technology discussions, noting there is still time to reach agreement. PAPUA NEW GUINEA agreed, saying “the structure of this session is stacked against small countries.” Pointing to the CTC’s lack of resources, AILAC warned that mitigation action and GST implementation cannot succeed without MoI.

Parties converged on draft conclusions forwarding the latest iteration of draft text to SBI 63.

**Linkages between the Technology Mechanism (TM) and the Financial Mechanism (FM):** In SBI informal consultations, Co-Facilitator Céline Phillips (France) noted that the draft text still contains various options and brackets and suggested continuing discussions at SBI 63 on the basis of this draft.

NORWAY, supported by BRAZIL, the UK, JAPAN, CANADA, AOSIS, the EU, and others, preferred continuing consideration of this matter at SBI 64 rather than SBI 63, noting the need to progress on other technology items, such as the CTC review and

operationalization of the technology implementation programme. The AFRICAN GROUP, ARAB GROUP, and CHINA favored discussions at SBI 63, with AILAC emphasizing the need to inform discussions on guidance to the Global Environment Facility and the Green Climate Fund. The LDCs lamented the continuous deferral and underscored the need for a substantive decision enhancing linkages between the TM and FM. BRAZIL underscored the packed technology agenda in Belém.

Parties converged on procedural conclusions, agreeing to continue consideration at SBI 63 based on the SBI 62 text.

**Technology Implementation Programme:** In SBI informal consultations co-facilitated by Elfriede More (Austria) and Omar Alcock (Jamaica), SBI Chair Julia Gardiner urged parties to consider forwarding the latest iteration of draft text to SBI 63.

JAPAN, the EU, and the UK supported the SBI Chair's proposal. The G-77/CHINA expressed concern that some interventions had not been adequately captured in the text. The LMDCs and ARAB GROUP opposed forwarding it and proposed reverting to the text from Baku, which the UK opposed. NORWAY proposed, but the G-77/CHINA rejected, "taking note" of the SBI 62 draft text rather than proceeding "on the basis of" said text. The G-77/CHINA suggested elaborating a revised version of the text, which the co-facilitators opposed, citing lack of time.

The co-facilitators will consult with the SBI Chair on the way forward.

### **Global Stocktake**

**Dialogue on implementing the Global Stocktake outcomes, referred to in paragraph 97 of decision 1/CMA.5:** During SBI informal consultations, Co-Facilitators Ricardo Marshall (Barbados) and Patrick Spicer (Canada) introduced draft CMA decision text. The UK, EIG, AUSTRALIA, JAPAN, and others stressed the text does not include a balanced reflection of parties' views and suggested amendments.

The UK, EU, and others called for reference to consideration of collective progress and identification of opportunities to implement "the elements that do not have an institutional home, including collective calls on energy transition." They also opposed "cherry-picking" paragraphs from Paris Agreement articles, preferring to refer to entire articles.

AILAC, supported by the EU and NEW ZEALAND, called for reference to "international cooperation" in the text on key enablers to support NDCs and national adaptation plans (NAPs). JAPAN supported referencing disenablers but opposed reference to unilateral trade measures, noting this is being discussed under the just transition work programme. The EU called for "no text" options in several paragraphs, including in relation to the text on unilateral trade measures.

In the afternoon, the co-facilitators introduced a revised draft CMA decision text. AUSTRALIA, JAPAN, the EU, and others supported forwarding the text to Belém. The LMDCs and ARAB GROUP opposed, expressing their preference for the previous iteration.

Parties then undertook an extensive discussion on how to proceed with the item. INDIA, supported by EGYPT, MOROCCO, AUSTRALIA, and the MALDIVES, but opposed by SAUDI ARABIA and CHINA, proposed including both iterations in a single document to be forwarded to Belém. The LDCs,

supported by the AFRICAN GROUP, but opposed by SAUDI ARABIA and CHINA, proposed referring to both iterations in SBI conclusions, stressing their opposition to a "no text" option.

The co-facilitators will consult with the SBI Chair on the way forward, presenting the four different options: the initial draft from the morning session; the revised draft; a combination of both iterations; or no text.

**Procedural and logistical elements of the GST:** In SB informal consultations co-facilitated by Kishan Kumarsingh (Trinidad and Tobago), parties discussed draft conclusions.

After hearing a report back from the UNITED ARAB EMIRATES on progress made in informal informals on the GST's relationship to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), the EU proposed capturing this progress in a new iteration of text to be forwarded to SB 63. SAUDI ARABIA, supported by the PHILIPPINES, said they would like to see the updated text before agreeing to any draft conclusions. Noting lack of time, Co-Facilitator Kumarsingh proposed, and parties agreed, to forward the latest iteration of draft text without capturing the recent advances from the informal informals.

### **Other Issues**

**Just Transition Work Programme:** In the SB contact group, Co-Chair Federica Fricano (Italy) and Joseph Teo (Singapore) introduced draft text containing draft SB conclusions and an informal note with a draft CMA decision.

The UK, AOSIS, the EIG, LDCs, EU, PHILIPPINES, and others supported forwarding the informal note to Belém provided no changes are made to the text at SB 62.

The LMDCs noted their concern with the informal note, but expressed willingness to forward it if two alternative options are added to a paragraph on the importance of facilitating universal access to clean energy. While the paragraph, as drafted, references deployment of renewable energy and clean cooking and "socioeconomic opportunities associated with transitioning away from fossil fuels in a just, orderly, and equitable manner, while acknowledging that pathways to energy transitions will vary by country in accordance with national circumstances," the alternative options would be:

- option 2, the importance of facilitating universal access to clean, reliable, affordable, and sustainable energy for all, and access to clean cooking, including "the use of fossil fuels" in developing countries acknowledging that transition pathways depend on national circumstances; and
- option 3, no text.

The ARAB GROUP supported the LMDCs' proposal, while the UK, EU, AOSIS, and others opposed.

PARAGUAY reiterated their objection to the reference to gender-based approaches to just transition. The RUSSIAN FEDERATION called for reference to unilateral cross-border measures.

On the draft SB conclusions, the LDCs, supported by AOSIS, proposed requesting the Secretariat to prepare a technical report on the instruments, initiatives, and processes under and outside the UNFCCC and Paris Agreement that are already supporting or can support the implementation of just transition, including through the work programme, to inform discussions at SB 63.

In the afternoon, EGYPT reported back from informal informals and presented a newly drafted option 2 for the paragraph on access to clean energy: “The importance of facilitating universal access to clean, reliable, and affordable and sustainable energy for all, including access to clean cooking, and that such efforts may promote energy security.” The LMDCs proposed to reinsert a “no text” option.

Regarding three placeholder options on trade measures, the LMDCs sought to delete the “no text” option.

The co-chairs will report to the SB Chairs.

**Gender:** In SBI informal consultations, Co-Facilitator Carol Franco (Dominican Republic) introduced SBI conclusions forwarding a revised informal note on potential activities for the new gender action plan (GAP) to SBI 63. The Secretariat indicated total estimated costs of EUR 1,434,000 per year for the currently envisioned list of activities. Responding to the UK and the EU, the Secretariat clarified that the current gender budget for 2024–2025 is EUR 1.1 million per year, and noted that estimates depend on the activities’ location, in-session or intersessional nature, and expected number of participants.

Parties welcomed the constructive engagement throughout SBI 62, acknowledging outstanding issues, especially on terminology. Many parties supported intersessional work, with AILAC and the AFRICAN GROUP emphasizing support for regional groups’ participation. Several parties underscored the importance of reaching agreement on the GAP at COP 30.

AUSTRALIA, the EU, UK, JAPAN, NEW ZEALAND, and NORWAY noted their vision for a nine-year GAP to align with the ten-year extension of the Lima Work Programme on gender, with the EU and NEW ZEALAND pointing to a review after four years. The EU and NEW ZEALAND suggested the Secretariat provide guidance on the timeline to implement activities and on relevant organizations to include. The AFRICAN GROUP underscored it is “a moral imperative” to deliver context-specific solutions that enhance women’s resilience to climate change, particularly women farmers that are the “backbones” of their communities. Other comments related to, among others:

- no backsliding on agreed language;
- references to, among others, gender mainstreaming, women environmental and human rights defenders, Indigenous women, care work, and gender- and age-disaggregated data;
- attention to multiple forms of discrimination as an overarching element of the GAP;
- strengthening the implementability of the GAP, particularly through financial support; and
- reflecting on what is applicable at the UNFCCC level and what relates to the national level.

ARGENTINA requested adding a footnote to the informal note, specifying that for the purpose of the document and references to gender under other workstreams and constituted bodies, Argentina understands “gender” as defined in Article 7.3 of the [Rome Statute](#).

Parties agreed to draft conclusions, as amended by Argentina, with a view to continuing discussions at SBI 63 on the basis of the latest informal note from SBI 62.

### Cooperation with other International Organizations:

Opening the consultations, SBSTA Chair Adonia Ayebare recalled that Parties had highlighted the need to enhance synergies and cooperation among the three Rio Conventions (climate change, biodiversity, and desertification). He proposed, and many parties supported, to continue consideration of this agenda item at SBSTA 63.

PALAU and the EIG called for a space to also continue the dialogue at COP 30. COLOMBIA, MONGOLIA, ARMENIA, the EIG, and PANAMA suggested a call for submissions ahead of SBSTA 63 to enable a constructive and informed exchange. COLOMBIA also emphasized strengthening the Joint Liaison Group. The EU suggested SBSTA 62 welcome the report of the Joint Liaison Group, and, with AUSTRALIA, noted there is no need to create an additional/separate agenda item on this in Belém.

The UK emphasized that synergies are not a standalone conversation but need to be mainstreamed across issues. The EU, supported by CANADA, underlined that discussions on synergies should not only pertain to the Rio Conventions but also other international organizations, with the EIG pointing to the [Bern process](#) on coordination among biodiversity-related conventions. The EU, AUSTRALIA, and the EIG proposed to revive information sessions with presentations from international organizations under this agenda item.

The SBSTA Chair requested the Secretariat to prepare draft conclusions.

### In the Corridors

The delayed opening of the Subsidiary Bodies’ substantive negotiations was felt acutely, as parties labored hard to clear out an array of outstanding agenda items—sometimes convening more than once on the same item throughout the day. Delegates aired feelings of “frustration,” “disappointment,” and even “bafflement” as last minute proposals were tabled and rejected. “We have shown our utmost flexibility thus far,” shared one delegate, “but this is not the gymnastics olympics.”

Many issues will enjoy the “luxury” of continued engagement at the next session in Belém. Yet, parties frequently clashed over what text—if any—would form the basis of negotiations going forward. Frustrated with the lack of trust in the room, the G-77/China tabled an alternative proposal for discussions on the Adaptation Fund—equal in substance, but different in structure compared to the co-facilitators’ informal note. On the dialogue for implementing the outcomes of the Global Stocktake, delegates face as many as four text options. “If we just keep on adding text, this will only burden discussions in Belém,” an irritated participant warned.

With the closing plenary to convene sometime on Thursday afternoon, parties have little time to iron out disagreements. “It will take me a week to recover from this,” predicted a tired delegate, bracing for the last stretch of what has been a challenging meeting.

The *Earth Negotiation Bulletin*’s summary and analysis of the Bonn Climate Change Conference will be available on Monday, 30 June 2025 at [enb.iisd.org/bonn-climate-change-conference-sb62-sbi62-sbsta62](https://enb.iisd.org/bonn-climate-change-conference-sb62-sbi62-sbsta62).