

Bonn Highlights: Thursday, 11 June 2026

Divergences were such that it is difficult to pin down what progress was achieved, if any, across negotiation rooms. Many sessions ran over their allocated time and delegates spent a lot of time debating the way forward on issues such as the Adaptation Fund and the Mitigation Work Programme.

Mitigation

Mitigation Work Programme (MWP): In SB informal consultations co-facilitated by Ursula Fuentes Hutfilter (Germany) and Maesela John Kekana (South Africa), Parties continued providing views on the future of the MWP.

JAPAN underlined the MWP's two key functions: to support implementation of Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) and send a strong signal to the international community to undertake ambitious mitigation action. They urged ensuring the MWP can achieve these functions. UKRAINE supported establishing a dedicated body for the MWP. The REPUBLIC OF KOREA and ALLIANCE OF SMALL ISLAND STATES (AOSIS) supported strengthening the operational link with the Global Stocktake (GST).

Several Parties proposed improvements to the global dialogues and investment-focused events, including: multi-year or thematic structuring of topics; a dedicated space for lessons learned and actionable solutions; preparation of case studies by the Secretariat to help developing countries with project development; and ensuring a balance in the consideration of opportunities, barriers, and challenges.

Several Parties raised points of order regarding the organization of work. The Co-Facilitators will provide a structure and guiding questions ahead of the next consultations.

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 comments on an informal note.

The LEAST DEVELOPED COUNTRIES (LDCs) stated that usage-based or user fees are not suitable for capacity-building activities that are fundamental to participation in cooperative approaches. They noted such fees should only be considered if restricted to maintenance costs and only if small island developing states (SIDS) and LDCs can request to be exempt. The AFRICAN GROUP and LDCs said Parties should not be required to pay fees to use the international registry. The AFRICAN GROUP, opposed by the LIKE-MINDED DEVELOPING COUNTRIES (LMDCs), suggested private entities potentially be required to pay such fees. The UK noted that fees would not necessarily constitute a barrier to participation, as even if Parties pay these fees, they do not necessarily bear the cost.

NEW ZEALAND said Article 6.2 does not require a bespoke financing arrangement and called for the note to reflect that Article 6.2 funding arrangements would follow the Convention's usual budget-setting processes. The EUROPEAN UNION (EU) expressed its preference for Article 6.2 to ultimately become self-financing through fees. The AFRICAN GROUP supported the options of funding through the core and supplementary budgets, especially for infrastructure and capacity-building, and for only operational costs to potentially be subject to fees.

Adaptation

Global Goal on Adaptation (GGA): In SBSTA informal consultations, Co-Facilitators Peter Gerard Wittoeck (Belgium) and Ricardo Delano Marshall (Barbados) invited views on: priorities for the first phase of the Baku Adaptation Roadmap (BAR); and the mandate, composition, modalities, and expected outcomes of the technical taskforce on adaptation indicators.

The GROUP OF 77 AND CHINA (G-77/CHINA) stressed that the BAR must ensure access to predictable, accessible finance to support adaptation implementation in accordance with Paris Agreement Article 9.1 (developed countries' finance provision commitment). CANADA, JAPAN, the UK, and EU disagreed, noting that adaptation finance is already addressed under other agenda items and constituted bodies.

Regarding the taskforce's mandate, GRUPO SUR, the ENVIRONMENTAL INTEGRITY GROUP (EIG), EU, CANADA, and RUSSIAN FEDERATION said it should develop metadata and methodologies to improve the 59 indicators.

On composition, the G-77/CHINA emphasized the taskforce should be party-driven. GRUPO SUR called for balanced membership from developing and developed countries. BRAZIL called for a mix of Parties and experts. DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO stressed equitable geographic representation and the participation of experts from relevant sectors and frontline communities. The EU suggested the taskforce should be composed of 16 members from UN agencies, ensuring gender balance. The EIG and INDEPENDENT ALLIANCE OF LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN (AILAC) said the taskforce should include experts familiar with the GGA Framework and the indicator work programme.

On modalities, AOSIS and the AFRICAN GROUP called for the workstreams on policy alignment and on metadata and methodologies to support one another. GRUPO SUR called for regular meetings of the taskforce in a hybrid format. CANADA suggested prioritizing virtual modalities and leveraging existing resources to ensure the timely delivery of technical outputs.

On expected outcomes, GRUPO SUR called for, among others, a report that includes examples of indicators tested by Parties to validate their applicability, robustness, and consistency across different contexts. NEW ZEALAND said the taskforce should support the delivery of nationally-appropriate outcomes.

Guidance relating to Adaptation Communications: In SBI informal consultations, Co-Facilitator Marie Wien Fjell (Norway) invited views on draft text.

The ARAB GROUP and LMDCs requested the deletion of a paragraph noting the ongoing development by various constituted bodies of recommendations on how to improve adaptation reporting, stating that it is premature for Parties to draw conclusions on the relevance of this work. The ARAB GROUP, supported by the LMDCs and JAPAN, called for focusing on the timeline for taking stock of the guidance on adaptation communications.

The ARAB GROUP expressed their preference for the Secretariat to prepare a synthesis report of Parties' submissions on experiences in applying the guidance for consideration at SBI 70 (June 2029), and for draft conclusions to be considered at CMA 11 (November 2029).

JAPAN expressed their willingness to consider the various timelines proposed, but stated, alongside the EU and UK, that any consideration of revisions to the adaptation communication guidance should take place after the review of the modalities, procedures, and guidelines (MPGs) of the Enhanced Transparency Framework. The LMDCs and AFRICAN GROUP emphasized that adaptation communications should not be explicitly tied to the MPG review process.

The Co-Facilitators will revise the draft text.

Least Developed Countries (LDCs): In SBI informal consultations, Co-Facilitator Rik den Hoedt (the Netherlands), invited views on draft SBI conclusions and draft COP and CMA decision texts.

On the SBI conclusions, the EU and UK supported "welcoming" the work programme of the LDC Expert Group (LEG) for 2026-2027 and the vision for LDCs to have National Adaptation Plans (NAPs) in place by 2030. The ARAB GROUP emphasized their preference to "take note" thereof.

On the draft decisions, the EU and JAPAN requested the deletion of a paragraph noting the importance of the provision of support and access to finance for NAP implementation, emphasizing that it is not an appropriate issue to be discussed under this agenda item.

Noting that matters relating to LDCs is a COP item, the ARAB GROUP and LMDCs expressed concern about the draft CMA decision text and requested the Secretariat to provide legal clarification. NORWAY pointed to the mandate from Decision 26/CMA.7 for SBI 64 to prepare a draft decision on LDCs matters for consideration by CMA 8. The ARAB GROUP called for adding references to: the impacts of unilateral trade measures on LDCs; and developed countries' finance obligations under Paris Agreement Article 9.1.

Finance

Adaptation Fund: In SBI informal consultations, Co-Facilitator Koosje Beumer-van der Loo (the Netherlands) invited views on the SBI 63 draft CMP and CMA decision text on arrangements for the Fund's transition to exclusively serve the Paris Agreement.

The G-77/CHINA underscored that the text is clean and proposed forwarding it to the SBI Chair. SWITZERLAND, the EU, UK, CANADA, and NORWAY reiterated the need to address Board membership as part of the transition arrangements. The ARAB GROUP and UGANDA urged against "keeping the transition hostage." SWITZERLAND emphasized that lack of agreement on all elements needed for the transition would be a collective failure and expressed hope that the matter could be resolved at the technical level.

The ARAB GROUP and AFRICAN GROUP underscored the need to arrange the monetization of share of proceeds (SOPs) as a first step, before engaging in discussions on membership. SOUTH

AFRICA noted that the transition takes effect once the SOPs are actually monetized, which will take time.

SWITZERLAND recalled that proposals for changing the composition of the Board were withdrawn at SB 62 to unlock agreement on the transition and ensure that the issue of Board membership is resolved at the time of monetization. They noted that the current proposal is: to have two seats each for "developed" and "developing" countries, instead of the current allocation of two seats each for "Annex I" and "non-Annex I" Parties; other seat denominations and proportions would remain the same; and not prejudging which countries identify as developed or developing.

The Co-Facilitators invited views on the other matters to be considered under the agenda item. The G-77/CHINA noted their support for the fifth review of the Adaptation Fund to take place after the transition. SWITZERLAND agreed.

The ARAB GROUP invoked Rule 34 (point of order) of the draft rules of procedure to call for the Co-Facilitators' ruling on whether there is consensus on the texts on the transition arrangements. The Co-Facilitators recalled that the CMP and CMA noted that further discussions on the basis of work done at SBI 63 does not prejudice the number of draft decisions on these matters. The ARAB GROUP appealed this, pointing to the SBI Chair's opening remarks on there being three mandates to be discussed under this agenda item, and questioned the basis on which a text that enjoys consensus would not be forwarded. The UK and NORWAY noted that while there are no amendments proposed to the texts on transition arrangements, there is no consensus on forwarding them without text on membership.

The legal counsel noted that: strictly speaking, the draft rules of procedure are applied in plenary settings, with discussions in contact groups and informal consultations being guided by these; texts are forwarded if there is consensus to do so; and, when in doubt, elected officers, such as the SBI Chair, should be consulted.

The Co-Facilitators will consult with the SBI Chair on the way forward.

Other Issues

Just Transition Work Programme (JTWP): SB Contact Group Co-Chair Joseph Teo (Singapore) invited further views on operationalizing the just transition mechanism.

On principles, INDIA stressed the right to development and poverty eradication. The EIG highlighted intergenerational equity. The EU referred to workers' rights and gender equality.

On objectives, INDIA, CHINA, and KUWAIT supported a broad understanding of just transition, emphasizing it should not be mitigation-centric. The EU and UK said it should be 1.5°C-aligned and grounded in the first GST.

On mechanism activities, many Parties highlighted knowledge sharing, international cooperation, and technical assistance. The UK proposed: annual events; relevant reporting, including on a transition away from fossil fuels; and toolkits and other knowledge products. The EU suggested a three-year work plan with well-defined activities.

Delegates strongly diverged over the mechanism's form. WOMEN AND GENDER said the mechanism should be a constituted body and, with ENVIRONMENTAL NGOS (ENGOS), said it should address financial issues. INDIA said the mechanism should support means of implementation, with NIGERIA urging scaled-up, new, and predictable climate finance. The UK opposed creating a new constituted body or a new financial mechanism. CANADA said the mechanism "will not be an avenue for additional financial resources." Highlighting that the Secretariat's mapping shows a wide range of existing institutions and activities, the EU said "the challenge is not institutional scarcity, but fragmentation."

Second periodic assessment of the effectiveness and adequacy of the support provided to the Technology Mechanism in supporting the implementation of the Paris Agreement: In SBI informal consultations, Co-Facilitator Stephen Minas (Cyprus) invited comments on draft SBI conclusions. Parties debated the organization of work, with the G-77/CHINA suggesting informal-informals to make progress across technology items.

Parties eventually agreed to proceed with paragraph-by-paragraph comments on the draft conclusions. The G-77/CHINA proposed adding preambular text recalling several CMA decisions. CHILE proposed requesting an update of the synthesis report on technology needs. Parties also discussed a request for the Secretariat to prepare an interim report on the second periodic assessment for consideration at SBI 66 (June 2027).

The Co-Facilitators will consult with the SBI Chair on scheduling an additional session for this item.

Capacity-building: In SBI informal consultations, Co-Facilitator Abze Djigma (Burkina Faso) invited views on: a draft COP decision on the fifth review of the implementation of the framework for capacity-building in developing countries under the Convention; and draft SBI conclusions on capacity-building under the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol.

On the fifth review, discussions centered on a G-77/CHINA proposal for a workshop to enable reflection on how to improve the effectiveness of the capacity-building framework and inform the sixth review.

In the draft SBI conclusions, KYRGYZSTAN asked to refer to mountain countries in addition to LDCs and SIDS in a reference to capacity gaps and needs in particularly-vulnerable developing countries.

Research and systematic observation: In SBSTA informal consultations, Co-Facilitator Patricia Nying'uro (Kenya) invited views on an informal note capturing discussions held thus far at SB 64.

The EU and UK supported text expressing concern about the El Niño phenomenon, while SAUDI ARABIA suggested it be removed. The EU also proposed new text on "information integrity" and countering misinformation. SAUDI ARABIA, opposed by the UK, suggested deleting text asking the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) to share regular updates. AOSIS, supported by the LDCs but opposed by INDIA, proposed text on limiting the magnitude and duration of the "overshoot" past 1.5°C.

Delegates also disagreed on text relating to tipping points, with the EU and UK seeking to remove a reference to "varying perspectives" on the concept's understanding, while INDIA and SAUDI ARABIA preferred to keep this, arguing that the issue is neither settled nor clear. INDIA, opposed by the EU and UK, suggested deleting the reference to irreversible changes.

Arrangements for intergovernmental meetings: During the SBI contact group, Co-Facilitators Felix Wertli (Switzerland) and Kaveh Guilanpour (Georgia) invited views on practical ways to improve the efficiency of the UNFCCC process.

AILAC proposed an external expert review of the process. AOSIS urged using Regional Climate Weeks more effectively. The EU suggested organizing mandated events in clusters, with some held virtually in the intersessional period, for instance during the Regional Climate Weeks. CHINA urged reviewing the duration, cost-effectiveness, and intended outcomes of mandated events.

JAPAN reiterated the need to consider the budgetary implications of decisions before they are made and, with the EIG, proposed discussing multi-year approaches. The AFRICAN GROUP called for timely publication of documents and concept notes to ensure groups can coordinate ahead of sessions.

The EIG proposed: capping the number of participants at COPs; virtual consultations ahead of sessions; and agenda rationalization within existing mandates. SOUTH AFRICA opposed agenda rationalization and the arbitrary removal of

agenda items, called for an agenda item on the climate finance work programme, and proposed exploring a balanced approach to limiting the number of mandated events per session. CHINA urged caution regarding merging agenda items, noting the consultations on which items to merge and how to do so would take a lot of valuable time.

Cooperation with other international organizations: In SBSTA informal consultations, Co-Facilitators Sara Victoria González (Dominican Republic) and Heloïse van Houten (the Netherlands) provided an overview of discussions so far and invited additional views.

The EU suggested technical cooperation on issues relating to capacity-building, transparency, and Indigenous Peoples. The ARAB GROUP proposed cooperation on issues relating to finance and the impacts of unilateral trade measures on developing countries.

ZIMBABWE and COLOMBIA called for strengthening the Joint Liaison Group (JLG). MONGOLIA proposed recommending that the JLG engages with stakeholders. GHANA suggested that the JLG hold side events to share information.

The ARAB GROUP, GHANA, and the RUSSIAN FEDERATION supported adopting only procedural conclusions only. GHANA underlined that policy coherence can be achieved in the national context but not internationally, as international organizations have different obligations, policy cycles, and reporting requirements.

The Co-Facilitators will prepare draft conclusions.

Dialogue on implementing the Global Stocktake (GST) outcomes: On the [second day](#) of this mandated event, discussions focused on key enablers for implementing the outcomes of the GST. Delegates identified:

- just transition that adequately protects workers and their rights;
- technology, capacity-building, and grants-based public finance;
- support for youth- and women-led initiatives and projects, including through dedicated and simplified funding windows;
- safeguards for, and effective protection of, Indigenous Peoples and their rights;
- integrating science and knowledge from other knowledge holders into climate action;
- international cooperation and removal of unilateral trade measures;
- enhanced knowledge-sharing initiatives;
- global carbon markets that ensure high integrity through measures such as sufficiently high carbon prices;
- strong linkages between the GST and the work programmes of UNFCCC constituted bodies, such as the Nairobi Work Programme; and
- accelerated action to reduce methane emissions.

In the Corridors

"Chilly" is how one delegate described the mood inside many negotiating rooms throughout the day, mirroring the unseasonably cold weather in the Rhine region.

Strong divergences notably emerged in the discussions on the operationalization of the just transition mechanism, which was established in Belém. "Some seem to think the sky is the limit here, but others are seeing very low clouds," opined a witty observer after developed countries responded with a "hard no" to calls for the mechanism to serve as a new finance channel.

Some had a "déjà vu" of the negotiations on the new collective quantified goal on finance, and not a pleasant one. "I swear, some of the statements that were read out must have been 10 pages long," said one observer, whose head was spinning after spending five hours in discussions on climate finance.

Pointing to the call for the SBI Chair or other higher-ups to sort out the way forward on several agenda items, one delegate suggested "a good downpour may be just what we need to clear the air."

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)

