

Bonn Highlights: Tuesday, 16 June 2026

Roadblocks emerged across negotiation rooms, including with regard to reporting and technology. References to finance proved very contentious in the discussions on the Global Goal on Adaptation, with delegates objecting to further engagement on the basis of the latest version of draft text.

Mitigation

Mitigation Work Programme (MWP): In the SB informal consultations, Co-Facilitator Ursula Fuentes Hutfilter (Germany) introduced three documents: draft SB 64 conclusions; an informal note containing section headings; and the Co-Facilitators' non-exhaustive reflection of the exchange of views at SB 64.

Parties expressed diverging views on the Co-Facilitators' reflections paper. The LIKE-MINDED DEVELOPING COUNTRIES (LMDCs), AFRICAN GROUP, ARAB GROUP, and RUSSIAN FEDERATION argued that the document does not adequately reflect the full range of views expressed by all Parties and also contains elements that fall outside the MWP's mandate. They expressed an unwillingness to engage with the paper and called for deleting the footnote in the draft conclusions that refers to the reflections paper.

The INDEPENDENT ALLIANCE OF LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN (AILAC), LEAST DEVELOPED COUNTRIES (LDCs), ALLIANCE OF SMALL ISLAND STATES (AOSIS), REPUBLIC OF KOREA, CANADA, NEW ZEALAND, and NORWAY supported retaining both the informal note and the reflections paper. The REPUBLIC OF KOREA described the reflections paper as an important foundation for future work. AILAC stressed that the MWP mandate includes the provision of guidance and actionable insights, and opposed efforts to prevent the issuance of such guidance. Several Parties suggested additional views to be included in the reflections paper.

Regarding the informal note, the LMDCs, AFRICAN GROUP, and ARAB GROUP, opposed by the EU, AOSIS, UKRAINE, and others, called for deleting the sub-bullets under the section on improvements to, and continuation of, the MWP. They stressed this list does not reflect consensus and preferred to retain the heading only.

On the draft conclusions, AOSIS, the LDCs, REPUBLIC OF KOREA, CANADA, and NEW ZEALAND, opposed by

the ARAB GROUP and RUSSIAN FEDERATION, supported the proposal for an intersessional workshop on the MWP's continuation, functioning, and effectiveness.

The Co-Facilitators will produce a new iteration of the documents.

Adaptation

Global Goal on Adaptation (GGA): In SB informal consultations, Co-Facilitator Ricardo Delano Marshall (Barbados) invited Parties to continue sharing their views on revised draft text.

Parties reiterated calls to streamline the list of options on the composition of the taskforce on indicator metadata and methodologies. CANADA suggested reflecting on expected deliverables and then discussing who would be best placed to prepare these.

ENVIRONMENTAL NGOS (ENGOS) called for explicit reference in the draft text to tripling adaptation finance, lamenting that, without means of implementation, the GGA is just "words on paper." INDIGENOUS PEOPLES ORGANIZATIONS (IPOS) called for an Indigenous Peoples' representative on the taskforce to support the inclusion of the lived experiences, knowledge systems, and governance practices of Indigenous Peoples.

JAPAN and NORWAY noted the text contains references to a substantial number of activities and outputs. They emphasized that, if Parties wish to retain these elements, the budgetary implications of such proposals must be discussed.

In the afternoon, the Co-Facilitators introduced a revised draft text and suggested Parties take it up in informal-informals.

The G-77/CHINA underscored their disappointment with the revised text and urged removing the brackets around paragraphs on: the GGA being implemented in accordance with the principles and provisions of the Convention and Paris Agreement; and urging full and urgent delivery of the call for efforts to at least triple adaptation finance by 2035. The EU, supported by NORWAY, CANADA, SWITZERLAND, JAPAN, and the UK also expressed concern, calling for no-text options for two paragraphs that reference tripling of adaptation finance. The EU and CANADA also called for bracketing the section on the Baku Adaptation Roadmap, noting many elements had not yet been discussed, and urged for discussions to focus on the taskforce.

The Co-Facilitators suggested: brackets around the taskforce-related options; removing the brackets around other individual

paragraphs; and bracketing the entire draft text. The EU and other developed countries opposed this, reiterating their call for no-text options, which the AFRICAN GROUP, AILAC, LMDCs, ARAB GROUP, and LDCs opposed.

The Co-Facilitators will seek the SB Chairs' guidance on the way forward.

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

Parties agreed to retain reference to the new collective quantified goal on climate finance (NCQG) in a paragraph of the draft CMA decision requesting the LEG to provide technical guidance and support for navigating evolving climate finance arrangements. They also agreed to remove this reference from the COP decision.

The EU and UK underscored that they cannot accept any text in the CMA and COP decisions referencing Paris Agreement Article 9.1 (developed countries' provision of finance) or unilateral trade-restrictive measures.

Discussions continued in the afternoon.

Reporting

Greenhouse gas data interface: In SBSTA informal consultations, Co-Facilitator Daniela Romano (Italy) invited further views on revised draft text.

The ARAB GROUP stressed the text does not reflect the views they expressed in past sessions. Supported by CHINA, they underscored that the GHG interface is to be facilitative, non-punitive, and non-intrusive by design, and that this is the basis on which Parties agreed to release data into the system. They noted that the flexible queries module that allows for the comparison of Party data alters the context in which Parties agreed to data sharing.

The EU, UK, and NORWAY emphasized their preference to retain all modules in the current interface. The EU recalled their understanding of the negotiations at SBSTA 62, noting compromises were made regarding which modules to exclude or retain, and that those retained would have the same functionality as those already in the GHG database. They noted the mandate for SBSTA 64 was to consider additional modules and not to redefine modules previously agreed to.

The Co-Facilitators will report to the SBI Chair that Parties could not reach agreement on the way forward.

Support for developing country reporting under the Paris Agreement: In SBI informal consultations co-facilitated by Ole-Kenneth Nielsen (Denmark), Parties reflected on draft text revised after informal-informals.

The UK, supported by the ENVIRONMENTAL INTEGRITY GROUP (EIG), EU, NORWAY, and CANADA, opposed text noting with deep concern that the current resources available under the ninth replenishment cycle of the Global Environment Facility (GEF-9) are insufficient to meet developing countries' transparency-related needs as GEF-9 levels represent a reduction compared to GEF-8. They underscored that every project request

under GEF-8 was funded and that the GEF-9 replenishment is not yet concluded. The AFRICAN GROUP opposed welcoming that, if additional resources are needed, developing countries may draw from their System for Transparent Allocation of Resources allocation.

Parties also discussed changes to various other paragraphs, including on the type of activities that maximize the reach and effectiveness of capacity-building activities and the workshop to be held in November 2026. Owing to lack of time, the Co-Facilitators suggested agreeing on procedural conclusions, with discussions to continue at SBI 65, possibly taking into account the Co-Facilitators' draft text. The UK opposed forwarding the draft text with the paragraph on concerns regarding GEF-9.

The Co-Facilitators will report to the SBI Chair that the group could not reach agreement on the way forward within the allocated time.

Support for non-Annex I reporting under the Convention:

In SBI informal consultations, co-facilitated by Sandra Motshwanedi (South Africa), Parties debated whether to agree on procedural conclusions and forward some form of text to inform further discussions at SBI 65. The G-77/CHINA opposed procedural conclusions without forwarding any text. Noting that GEF-9 is not concluded, the UK and JAPAN opposed forwarding text that includes a paragraph noting with deep concern the 27% reduction in resources for the climate focal area between GEF-8 and GEF-9. The EU suggested continuing discussions "taking into account elements of" the SBI 64 text. All Parties shared their disappointment at the lack of substantive progress, despite constructive discussions.

The Co-Facilitators will report to the SBI Chair that Parties could not reach agreement on the way forward within the allocated time.

Technology

Host of the Climate Technology Centre: In SBI informal consultations, Co-Facilitator Mareer Mohamed Husny (Maldives) invited Parties to consider draft SBI conclusions, draft COP and CMA decisions, and elements of a memorandum of understanding (MoU) with the host. The draft conclusions and decisions recommend the UN Environment Programme (UNEP) as host and set out potential options for exploring collaboration with other organizations, such as with the UN Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) and UN Office for Project Services (UNOPS).

On the MoU, the AFRICAN GROUP and LDCs said it should not impose specific partnerships on the host. The ARAB GROUP supported including partnerships in the MoU, and proposed bracketing text naming UNEP as the host until the details of the MoU are agreed. The AFRICAN GROUP, EU, and LDCs underscored widespread support for UNEP as host. After internal consultation within the Group, the G-77/CHINA reported that acceptance of UNEP as host would need to be accompanied by a clear outcome on partnerships.

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

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-Facilitators Pemy Gasela (South Africa) and Stephen Minas (Cyprus) invited views on revised draft SBI conclusions. They highlighted the Secretariat's advice that some bracketed additions may not be within the scope of the periodic assessment as agreed in [Decision 16/CMA.1](#).

The EU and JAPAN cautioned against reopening the scope and modalities of the assessment. JAPAN expressed openness to specify that the Secretariat's interim report feeding into the assessment include relevant findings on the effectiveness and adequacy of the support, so long as the proposed reference to "accessibility and impact of support" is removed.

Underscoring that this would inform the assessment of adequacy, the LDCs and ARAB GROUP proposed taking account of the technology priorities identified in technology needs assessments, Nationally Determined Contributions, and national adaptation plans.

Pointing to the lack of time for further engagement, the Co-Facilitators proposed adopting procedural conclusions with a view to continuing discussions at SBI 65 on the basis of the current draft text. The LDCs, ARAB GROUP, and AOSIS called for more time to reach agreement on the remaining brackets and proposed additions. Recalling the instruction that there would be no further slot to consider this matter at SBI 64, NORWAY and the EU urged avoiding the application of Rule 16 to capture progress made.

The ARAB GROUP urged the Co-Facilitators to consult with the SBI Chair. The Co-Facilitators noted there is no consensus on adopting procedural conclusions. They will report to the SBI Chair.

Other Issues

Just Transition Work Programme (JTWP): In the SB Contact Group co-chaired by Joseph Teo (Singapore), EGYPT reported on informal-informals on the terms of reference (ToR) for the review of the JTWP, noting persistent disagreement on scope.

Co-Chair Teo introduced an informal note containing:

- a non-exhaustive list of key messages from the fifth dialogue under the JTWP;
- a placeholder for key messages from the upcoming sixth dialogue;
- a placeholder for the outcome of the JTWP review; and
- an indicative and non-exhaustive list of elements on the process for operationalization of the just transition mechanism (JTM), divided into sections on context, purpose, functions, integration, coordination and coherence, barriers and opportunities, international cooperation, modalities and governance, timelines, and links to the JTWP.

AILAC, BRAZIL, NORWAY, AOSIS, JAPAN, the AFRICAN GROUP, EIG, and UK welcomed the informal note as a basis for discussions. The ARAB GROUP said the text does not reflect the Group's priorities, with SAUDI ARABIA underscoring it has no formal status. Many Parties suggested messages on the fifth

dialogue. Co-Chair Teo suggested taking these up at SB 65 and urged focusing the discussion on the JTM's operationalization.

On the JTM, AILAC suggested reviewing the timelines. BRAZIL, NORWAY, and CHINA said modalities and governance should be considered separately. CHINA and SAUDI ARABIA, opposed by the EU, suggested adding a section on principles. The AFRICAN GROUP urged strengthening the focus on international cooperation. INDIA said the text could be forwarded to SB 65 as a simple "compilation of views."

Discussions on the ToR will continue in informal-informals.

SB Chairs' follow-up meeting on the Climate Change and Trade Dialogue: SBI Chair Julia Gardiner said the meeting had been convened to respond to Parties' questions on next steps, following the first Dialogue held at SB 64. She shared the Secretariat's legal guidance that paragraph 57 of the [Global Mutirão](#) decision, which established the Dialogue series, does not provide for a report or other formal follow up from the Dialogue sessions scheduled for SB 64, SB 66 (June 2027), and SB 68 (June 2028). She noted that the Dialogue was webcast and statements will be available on the Secretariat website.

The ARAB GROUP, AFRICAN GROUP, and LMDCs said this is inadequate and called for a written report capturing the discussions from the Dialogue. The EU observed that a report was mandated for this process, but only after the three Dialogues and high-level event have taken place. The UMBRELLA GROUP opposed revisiting "carefully-balanced decisions" and urged respecting the Secretariat's interpretation.

The PHILIPPINES asked whether anything precludes the SB Chairs from producing reports under their own authority. SBI Chair Gardiner noted the Secretariat's advice that there is no mandate for an official report, but the SB Chairs may provide an informal record, should they so decide. Responding to a question about whether the Global Mutirão's request for a report after the high-level event in 2028 creates grounds for a new agenda item, she shared the Secretariat's clarification that it does not, noting that Parties may, according to the draft rules of procedure, propose new agenda items.

SBI Chair Gardiner said the SB Chairs will prepare an "informal note under their own authority and with no legal status" as a record for the incoming SB Chairs to take into account as they prepare for the next two Dialogues.

Research and systematic observation: In SBSTA informal consultations, Co-Facilitators Frank McGovern (Ireland) and Patricia Nying'uro (Kenya) introduced a revised informal note, which Parties generally welcomed as a basis for further work. Proposed amendments related to, among others, the science-policy interface, integrity of climate change information, climate scenarios and modeling, carbon dioxide removal (CDR), research gaps, and tipping points.

On the science-policy interface and integrity of climate change information, BRAZIL, supported by AOSIS and CHILE, proposed referencing the need to counter climate change misinformation "and disinformation." INDIA and the ARAB GROUP opposed, cautioning that references to misinformation and disinformation could be used to discredit genuine scientific debate.

Regarding understanding climate risks and impacts, AOSIS called for specifying that climate impacts will increase with every increment of warming, especially over 1.5°C. The EU questioned the phrase “varying perspectives in the understanding of tipping points” and proposed changing this to “ongoing research on tipping points.” INDIA, KENYA, and the ARAB GROUP, opposed by the UK, proposed deleting language encouraging the scientific community to “further develop scenarios that minimize the magnitude and duration of an exceedance of 1.5°C.” KENYA and the ARAB GROUP also opposed reference to “transformation pathways,” with KENYA alternatively calling for adding reference to the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities.

BRAZIL expressed concern that the text singles out land-based CDR. VANUATU highlighted that while the text captures the risks of CDR, it does not outline the solution, which is to reduce the risk of overshoot.

Discussions continued in informal-informals.

Arrangements for intergovernmental meetings: In the SBI contact group, Co-Chairs Felix Wertli (Switzerland) and Kaveh Guilanpour (Georgia) invited views on revised draft text.

CHINA highlighted as redlines the need to: specifically refer to UN General Assembly (UNGA) Resolution 2758 (restoration of the lawful rights of the People’s Republic of China in the UN); remove language imposing conditions on proposals for new agenda items, regardless of guardrail references to the draft rules of procedure; and delete reference to Parties exercising moderation in the number of delegates they register. JAPAN opposed including references to specific political issues.

The EU, CANADA, EIG, AILAC, and YOUTH NGOs (YOUNGO) called for continued discussion at SBI 65, with the EU and AILAC emphasizing this be done on the basis of submissions and a related information paper on the organization of mandated events and the management of meeting agendas. The ARAB GROUP and SOUTH AFRICA preferred continued discussions at SBI 66. JAPAN and CANADA called for “inclusive and equitable” rather than “adequate” opportunities for Parties to engage in consultations, and for this to extend to “all” Parties.

The AFRICAN GROUP called for deleting a request for the Secretariat to continue providing capacity-building for Party delegates, and suggested the Secretariat provide an update on its implementation of the relevant mandate from SBI 62, including in terms of demand, outcome, and budgetary implications.

Responding to the UK on how constituencies are recognized and what would be needed to recognize a disability constituency, the Secretariat noted that: the current ones mirror the nine Major Groups established in Agenda 21; there are four informal groups that largely receive the same consideration as the constituencies, save for some rights with budgetary implications; and the Secretariat would follow Parties’ guidance on adding more constituencies.

The Co-Chairs will revise the draft text. They encouraged informal discussions among Parties in the meantime.

Cooperation with other international organizations: In SBSTA informal consultations, Co-Facilitator Sara Victoria

González (Dominican Republic) invited views on two draft texts: a revised draft text prepared by the Co-Facilitators, which, among others, specifies the creation of opportunities for Parties to share their relevant experiences and for discussions to continue at SBSTA 65; and a proposal by the Arab Group, which foresees engagement to continue at SBSTA 66.

The ARAB GROUP said they do not support “taking this topic further” and that their proposal represents their maximum flexibility. The RUSSIAN FEDERATION echoed the Arab Group, underscoring their opposition to introducing activities that could broaden the mandate of this agenda item and institutionalize a workstream on cooperation with other international organizations. Emphasizing the need to continue discussions at SBSTA 65, PACIFIC SIDS (P-SIDS) called for constructive engagement rather than reiteration of national positions.

After a huddle, Parties reflected on a revised draft text, whereby the SBSTA agrees: that, within the scope of the agenda item, future consideration will also include, *inter alia*, the exchange of information and Parties’ views on opportunities to enhance the effectiveness of the Joint Liaison Group and cooperating with other international organizations, as appropriate; and to continue consideration of this matter at SBSTA 66 and welcome consultations to be undertaken by the SBSTA Chair in conjunction with COP 31. P-SIDS said their agreement to continue discussions at SBSTA 66 rather than SBSTA 65 is conditional on the SBSTA Chair’s consultations at COP 31. The Secretariat noted this is not procedurally possible.

The Co-Facilitators will report to the SBSTA Chair that no agreement could be reached within the allocated time.

In the Corridors

As the clock counts down to the end of the 2026 June Climate Meetings, the tally of agenda items that went Rule 16—with Parties unable to even agree on procedural conclusions that could forward some text to serve as the basis for continued discussions at a future session—kept growing throughout the day.

With Co-Facilitators emphasizing that the allocated time on various agenda items was up, some delegates were disgruntled to see that additional time slots had been scheduled the following day for “a select number of items.” Many negotiators working on reporting support and technology items had hoped that further progress could be achieved with “just a little more time,” possibly in informal-informals, but this was not granted to them. Others were skeptical that more time would do the trick. “In any case, a quick look at the schedule for the next day shows just how many issues we still need to consider,” added an observer.

Adaptation finance turned out to be the most sensitive topic of the day. Developing countries called for Heads of Delegation to provide guidance on the Adaptation Fund’s transition to exclusively serving the Paris Agreement. In negotiations on the Global Goal on Adaptation, both developing and developed countries rejected a revised text on the grounds of finance-related references.

Not everyone seemed to feel it was time to give up, however. “We still have two days left. I’m sure we can salvage something,” opined one delegate involved in the just transition talks.