

Bonn Highlights: Tuesday, 9 June 2026

Delegates rushed from one negotiation session to the next throughout the day, with discussions touching on mitigation, adaptation finance, reporting, and capacity-building, among others. The need to streamline processes featured prominently across these discussions.

Mitigation

Mitigation Work Programme (MWP): In SB informal consultations, Co-Facilitators Ursula Fuentes Hutfilter (Germany) and Maesela John Kekana (South Africa) pointed to the submissions on the continuation, effectiveness, and functioning of the MWP to inform an exchange of views at SB 64. They highlighted that none of the submissions suggested the MWP should not continue and noted agreement that a continuation should come with improvements. The LIKE-MINDED DEVELOPING COUNTRIES (LMDCs) and ARAB GROUP underscored that the existence of submissions outlining expectations towards a continued work programme should not be interpreted as support for the MWP's continuation. The ARAB GROUP also emphasized that SB 64 should facilitate an exchange of views without engaging on draft decision text.

The ALLIANCE OF SMALL ISLAND STATES (AOSIS) and INDEPENDENT ALLIANCE OF LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN (AILAC) underscored that the MWP is not living up to expectations. AOSIS said the MWP should contribute to implementing the outcome of the first Global Stocktake (GST 1), particularly the energy-related calls, and advancing the long-term goals of the Paris Agreement. AILAC said it should draw on the GST 1 outcome, including on deforestation and transitioning away from fossil fuels, and serve as input to subsequent GSTs. AILAC also called for regional dialogues.

Arrangements for funding infrastructure, processes, and capacity-building for implementing Paris Agreement Article 6.2 (bilateral cooperative approaches): In SBI informal consultations, Co-Facilitators Pacifica F. Achieng Ogola (Kenya) and Peer Stiansen (Norway) invited Parties' views on how to facilitate consistent and stable funding for the Article 6.2 processes and capacity-building.

Reflecting on a [technical paper](#) on funding options, Parties asked clarification questions about the amounts allocated for different activities, the expected long-run costs of activities, and potential cost savings options. Views diverged on the option of charging usage-based or user fees, with the ARAB GROUP and AILAC opposing additional burdens on participating Parties. AILAC recalled the international registry was developed to support the participation of Parties that do not have access to a registry and underscored that charging a user fee defeats this purpose.

9th meeting of the Glasgow Committee on Non-market Approaches (NMAs): During the SBSTA Contact Group, Co-Chairs Charles Hamilton (the Bahamas) and Angela Friedrich (Austria) invited views on topic ideas for spinoff groups at SB 64. Delegates made suggestions relating to, among others, forest ecosystems, carbon sequestration, transitioning away from fossil fuels, and eliminating fossil fuel subsidies.

The LMDCs opposed topics focusing on specific emission sources or sectors. SWITZERLAND asked for legal clarification about the mandate and scope of the contact group's discussions. Following consultations with the Secretariat, the Co-Chairs confirmed that there is no restriction on spinoff group topics and delegates are free to attend the spinoff groups they choose.

Emissions from Aviation and Maritime Transport: SBSTA informal consultations were co-facilitated by Jakob Wiesbauer-Lenz (Austria) and Sonam Tashi (Bhutan). The INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION ORGANIZATION and INTERNATIONAL MARITIME ORGANIZATION discussed some of their ongoing efforts in reducing emissions. Parties agreed on procedural conclusions, noting the SBSTA continued consideration of this item and agreed to continue consideration of this matter at SBSTA 65.

Adaptation

Workshop under the Baku Adaptation Roadmap: In the first part of the [workshop](#), Parties reflected on how the adaptation architecture supports the implementation of the Global Goal on Adaptation (GGA). Among others, the EU stressed moving away from developing more technical papers and setting up new processes, and instead, joining forces with practitioners to advance implementation at the national and subnational levels. AOSIS noted lack of support for the implementation of National Adaptation Plans. The ARAB GROUP said the adaptation architecture should support regional and national adaptation planning along different warming increments, as these come with different challenges. AILAC disagreed, stating that focusing on higher warming scenarios risks shifting attention away from urgent mitigation efforts to limit warming to 1.5°C.

The second part focused on means of implementation, with discussions centering around the structural, institutional, and procedural barriers developing countries face when accessing finance, technology transfer, and capacity-building. The G-77/CHINA highlighted the quality of available finance as a key barrier to implementation and called for increased grant financing. GRUPO SUR emphasized that going into debt to pay for adaptation exacerbates climate injustice. AOSIS pointed out that Pacific SIDS received only 2% of all adaptation finance allocated between 2019-2025.

JAPAN noted that availability of support alone does not ensure implementation on the ground and called for enhancing enabling

conditions. The MARSHALL ISLANDS stressed the need to harmonize application and reporting requirements across funders.

Finance

Adaptation Fund: In SBI informal consultations, Co-Facilitator Isatou Camara (The Gambia) recalled the mandate to discuss arrangements for the Adaptation Fund to exclusively serve the Paris Agreement, membership of the Fund's Board (AFB), and the Fund's fifth review. She noted lack of agreement at previous sessions and the mandate to recommend draft decisions for consideration by the 21st meeting of the Conference of the Parties (COP) serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP 21) and the eighth meeting of the COP serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement (CMA 8). She enjoined delegates to make as much progress as possible at the technical level, recalling the SBI Chair's intention to consult Heads of Delegation on this matter.

Noting that the three issues will be considered sequentially, Camara invited views on the fifth review, highlighting the options, in the [informal note](#) from SBI 63, to either initiate the review immediately or after the Fund's transition. The LEAST DEVELOPED COUNTRIES (LDCs), ARAB GROUP, AFRICAN GROUP, AILAC, AOSIS, and LMDCs urged considering the transition first in order to ensure a swift monetization of the share of proceeds (SOPs) from Paris Agreement Article 6.4. UGANDA said the review should take place after the transition.

The G-77/CHINA emphasized the need for separate texts for each issue. SWITZERLAND and the EU underscored that AFB membership terminology is not a separate issue, but an essential part of the transition. The AFRICAN GROUP suggested the CMP could start working with the interim trustee to facilitate the monetization of SOPs. SWITZERLAND said monetization signifies the transition and that this cannot take place without a resolution on membership terminology. After a huddle, the G-77/CHINA proposed working on instructions to the bodies, such as the AFB and the Global Environment Facility (GEF) Council, to ensure the interim trustee can receive SOPs, underscoring that this does not require agreement on all transition arrangements.

Dialogue on finance flow alignment: The 2026 Dialogue Co-Chairs Debra-Lee Swanepoel (South Africa) and Ralien Bekkers (the Netherlands) noted the first day of this two-day [mandated event](#) focuses on nationally determined policies and instruments to implement Paris Agreement Article 2.1(c) and its complementarity with Article 9 (on finance flow alignment and finance, respectively). UNFCCC Executive Secretary Simon Stiell said finance flow alignment is key to delivering on global commitments and national plans. He pointed out that finance is currently not flowing to climate action at the speed or scale required, with high levels of investments still flowing to polluting sectors and industries. André Corrêa do Lago, COP 30 President, underscored that the urgency of the climate crisis calls for using every available tool and that finance flow alignment needs to respond to countries' specific conditions.

Presentations highlighted, among others: perceived high risks of agriculture and water management projects, where returns are less predictable than in the energy sector; Norway's approach to carbon pricing, which covers about 85% of emissions and generates revenue used to support a strong welfare system and lower other tax burdens; de-risking initiatives aimed at unlocking private capital; and the role of country platforms to combine domestic and international public and private finance.

Reporting

Support for developing country reporting under the Paris Agreement: In SBI informal consultations, Co-Facilitator Ole-Kenneth Nielsen (Denmark) pointed to the reports on [experiences](#)

[and challenges](#) related to implementing Article 13 of the Paris Agreement (Enhanced Transparency Framework, ETF) and [lessons learned](#) from supporting activities.

Parties welcomed the reports and the previous day's [World Café](#), especially for fostering direct communication with the GEF and its implementing agencies. The G-77/CHINA called for using the insights on challenges and lessons learned to tailor supporting activities, with the LDCs suggesting these may be agreed upon at CMA 8. The AFRICAN GROUP called for the Secretariat to provide an update on types of technical support it provides as well as the relevant budget status, such as for the Consultative Group of Experts. The LDCs suggested that the technical expert reviews could be leveraged to foster national experts' capacity-building.

The Co-Facilitators invited written input to inform the preparation of draft text.

Support for non-Annex I reporting under the Convention: In SBI informal consultations, Co-Facilitator Sandra Motshwanedi (South Africa) noted that the GEF had provided an update on its support. As with reporting under the Paris Agreement, the AFRICAN GROUP called for the Secretariat to provide an overview on supporting activities and the relevant budget status.

The UK noted that the reporting architecture has evolved and that biennial transparency reports under the ETF are now the central reporting vehicle. The UK, supported by the EU, suggested that, unless there is evidence that support for national communications is insufficient, the SBI should reduce the frequency of consideration of support for reporting under the Convention in order to avoid duplication with the discussions on support for reporting under the Paris Agreement. The G-77/CHINA cautioned that not all countries are reporting under the Paris Agreement, with the AFRICAN GROUP pointing to flexibility for LDCs and SIDS, among others. The LMDCs and ARAB GROUP emphasized the continuous importance of support for reporting under the Convention and urged maintaining the frequency of considering this item. The UK underscored that reporting barriers are the same regardless of whether reports are prepared under the Convention or the Paris Agreement.

The Co-Facilitators invited written input to inform the preparation of draft text.

Technology

Host of the Climate Technology Centre (CTC): In SBI informal consultations facilitated by Mareer Mohamed Husny (Maldives) and Stig Svenningsen (Norway), Parties exchanged views on the selection of a host for the CTC and the terms of a memorandum of understanding (MoU) with the future host.

On the host, the LMDCs said the two shortlisted candidates—the UN Environment Programme (UNEP) and the consortium of the UN Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) and the UN Office for Project Services (UNOPS)—both had strengths and areas of concern. On strengths, they said UNEP has a proven track record, while UNIDO has strong industrial and project management expertise. They called for questioning UNIDO on audit-related matters and UNEP on resource mobilization. The EU favored UNEP, stating that it clearly meets the selection criteria, such as on funding, continuity, and a vision for future CTC operations that goes beyond the status quo.

On the MoU, the G-77/CHINA said it should include resource mobilization and “matchmaking,” including an annual core funding target and the possibility of regular donor roundtables. The AFRICAN GROUP urged an arrangement that supports quantifiable deployment of technology.

Linkages between the Technology Mechanism and the Financial Mechanism: In SBI informal consultations co-facilitated by Céline Phillips (France) and Omar Alcock (Jamaica), Parties discussed a [draft COP decision text](#) developed at SBI 62.

The AFRICAN GROUP urged Parties to find common ground, suggesting that agreement was “so close” in 2025. On the mode of work, the EU said that, since the whole text is bracketed, discussions should start from the top. The G-77/CHINA suggested removing brackets from many paragraphs and supported including text calling for a technical paper on financial options for technology transfer.

Other Issues

Just Transition Work Programme (JTWP): In the SB contact group, Co-Chair Joseph Teo (Singapore) invited views on the terms of reference (ToR) for reviewing the JTWP. He pointed to the [informal summary](#) of the fifth dialogue under the JTWP, and the “[interim output](#)” on the mapping of relevant instruments, initiatives, and processes.

The EU, AILAC, and LDCs said the ToR should be adopted as soon as possible. NORWAY suggested the review address whether: the JTWP was implemented in a manner that covers all elements of its scope; participation in the JTWP was satisfactory; there are better ways of including stakeholders; and work under other Paris Agreement bodies was used. The Environmental Integrity Group (EIG) highlighted assessing the JTWP’s embeddedness in the broader UNFCCC system. NIGERIA and CHINA suggested assessing gaps in implementation. The EU called for assessing effectiveness and efficiency, with CANADA highlighting resource efficiency. Several Parties suggested inviting submissions to serve as input to the review.

Response measures: In the SB Contact group, Co-Chair Veronika Skolasztika Bagi (Hungary) noted the mandate for SB 64 to: consider case studies in the [2025 annual report](#) of the Katowice Committee on Impacts (KCI); decide on input for the technical assessment component of GST 2; and build awareness about analyzing and reporting on impacts of response measures.

The G-77/CHINA emphasized that response measures must not impose a new burden on developing countries. They welcomed case studies in the KCI’s annual report, and said the input to GST 2 should assess socioeconomic impacts. They also expressed concern at significant delays in the KCI’s work. The ARAB GROUP and CHINA said response measures should not be used to create trade barriers.

Agriculture: In SB informal consultations, Co-Facilitator Claudia Heidecke (Germany) highlighted the mandate to continue discussions based on the [draft text](#) from SB 63. She also pointed to a [recent workshop](#) on systematic approaches to agriculture, food systems, and food security, and an annual [synthesis report](#) on agriculture by the Secretariat. Finally, she drew attention to the [online portal](#) established under the joint work on agriculture and food security.

CANADA urged concrete outcomes that prioritize outstanding work, including follow up on the workshop, synthesis report, and portal. The ARAB GROUP said it cannot support using agriculture to impose rules or one-size-fits-all constraints on developing countries. The EU regretted that work on the draft text could not be completed at the last session, but observed that the text had at least been simplified. They agreed with the Arab Group on not imposing constraints, but noted that the current draft text does not seek to do this.

The G-77/CHINA called for more time to coordinate its position.

Arrangements for intergovernmental meetings: During the SBI Contact Group, Co-Chairs Felix Wertli (Switzerland) and Kaveh Guilanpour (Georgia) invited views on planning for future sessions, increasing the efficiency of the UNFCCC process, and enhancing observer engagement.

On future sessions, the G-77/CHINA questioned the omission of the climate finance work programme from the CMA 8 provisional agenda and called for its inclusion as a sub-item under

matters relating to finance. NORWAY and SOUTH AFRICA urged a timely decision about the host of COP 33. AILAC called for more manageable agendas and, recalling the COP 30 closing plenary, reiterated the need to ensure inclusivity and order. The EU urged ensuring the host country agreement (HCA) incorporates respect for human rights, and that future sessions’ logistical arrangements and costs meet delegates’ expectations. The EIG called for a cost control clause in the HCA.

On efficiency, SOUTH AFRICA proposed training new youth delegates and opposed arbitrary sunset or removal of agenda items. JAPAN called for understanding the cost implications of decisions prior to their adoption. The ARAB GROUP proposed clustering mandated events.

On observer engagement, the EIG, AOSIS, and LDCs stressed the need for timely issuance of visas. The ARAB GROUP said efforts to improve observer engagement should focus on enhancing participation of Global South delegates. The DISABILITY CAUCUS requested recognition as a full constituency and urged strengthening accessibility through measures such as sign language and accessibility information.

Cooperation with other international organizations: In SBSTA informal consultations, Co-Facilitators Sara Victoria González (Dominican Republic) and Heloïse van Houten (the Netherlands), pointed to a summary of cooperative activities with UN entities and international organizations.

The EU, EIG, UK, AILAC, MONGOLIA, CANADA, and JAPAN underscored the need to enhance synergies among the Rio Conventions to, among others, increase coherence and support the effective use of limited resources. Acknowledging the challenge of synergizing separate processes and reporting systems, COLOMBIA said that enhancing synergies will assist in the implementation of all Rio Conventions.

The RUSSIAN FEDERATION highlighted risks such as mandate creep, duplication of work, weakened accountability, and competing priorities. CHINA cautioned against overstepping the jurisdiction of other treaties and noted the budget implications of expanding existing mandates. The ARAB GROUP underlined that cooperation among the Rio Conventions is already taking place through the Joint Liaison Group and that there is no need to expand this discussion beyond existing mandates. They called for the Co-Facilitators to take note of views expressed by Parties and conclude consideration of this agenda item.

In the Corridors

With the 2026 June Climate Meetings having opened without a hitch, the second day had delegates hurrying from one negotiation session to the next. A number of sessions echoed broader debates on the need to reform the multilateral system and “streamline” it with a view to increase “efficiency” and leverage “synergies,” to name just a few buzzwords.

Some Parties raised concrete proposals to ensure future UNFCCC meetings meet expectations, including with respect to logistics and overall costs. Yet, while everyone agrees that the climate negotiations agenda has grown unwieldy, fears loom large that any sort of streamlining may be misused to get rid of topics that are “dearer to some Parties than others,” as one observer put it, “except perhaps aviation and maritime transport, whose consideration Parties were again quick to conclude.”

A seasoned delegate leaving the session on cooperation with other international organizations was especially frustrated to see that discussions in Bonn still risk “ending nowhere,” despite broad agreement on the value of enhancing coordination among the Rio Conventions. “At the end of the day, we cannot just keep complaining about reporting burdens and duplication of efforts without providing a clear reform mandate,” they warned, echoing the Executive Secretary’s opening remarks.

Follow daily coverage and photos of the 2026 Bonn Climate Change Conference

English



Français



enb.iisd.org



subscribe at bit.ly/enbupdate



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



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

