

## Bonn Highlights: Wednesday, 17 June 2026

The day was replete with intense debates. In several rooms, delegates denounced others for “blocking” progress. Discussions on adaptation, technology, and science were particularly thorny.

### Mitigation

**Mitigation Work Programme (MWP):** In SB informal consultations, Co-Facilitators Ursula Fuentes Hutfilter (Germany) and Maesela John Kekana (South Africa), introduced a revised “reflections paper,” informal note, and draft SB 64 conclusions. Several Parties, including ALLIANCE OF SMALL ISLAND STATES (AOSIS) and THE INDEPENDENT ALLIANCE OF LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN (AILAC) lamented the changes made to the documents, and proposed insertions. The LIKE-MINDED DEVELOPING COUNTRIES (LMDCs), ARAB GROUP, and AFRICAN GROUP reiterated their previous objections to including a reference to the reflections paper in the SB conclusions.

Following additional consultations in huddles, BRAZIL reported back to the Co-Facilitators that no agreement had been reached on which documents to forward. They also reported that Parties had agreed that Brazil, in its national capacity, could informally produce a collection of Parties’ views and circulate it for consideration by Parties. BRAZIL also highlighted options relating to the other issues of contention, such as the proposal to hold an intersessional workshop. They therefore requested an additional negotiation slot for the following day, and for the session to be attended by the SB Chairs.

### Adaptation

**Global Goal on Adaptation (GGA):** In SB informal consultations, co-facilitated by Ricardo Delano Marshall (Barbados), the SB Chairs noted contention around the reference to tripling adaptation finance and proposed holding bilateral meetings to understand diverging views and devise a way forward.

The G-77/CHINA raised a procedural issue regarding the bracketing of paragraphs referencing work under the GGA to be implemented in accordance with the principles of the Convention and Paris Agreement, as well as references to paragraph 34 of [Decision 12/CMA.7](#) (call for efforts to at least triple adaptation finance by 2035) and paragraph 54 of [Decision 1/CMA.7](#) (work programme on climate finance) within the text that is bracketed in its entirety. The EU disagreed, stating that this is standard practice, and suggested Parties engage with the text paragraph-by-paragraph. With the UK, CANADA, and NORWAY, they supported the SB Chairs’ proposed way forward.

INDIA argued that having bracketed paragraphs within an entirely bracketed text sends a signal that there is more

convergence on some parts of the text than others. JAPAN expressed their preference to retain existing brackets and encouraged Parties to focus on developing agreeable text for the technical taskforce.

In the afternoon, the SB Chairs introduced a revised bracketed draft text, which introduces verbatim references to previous Decisions as alternative options for contentious paragraphs. They suggested that Parties consider the new text in informal-informals.

The ARAB GROUP, ENVIRONMENTAL INTEGRITY GROUP (EIG), LMDCs, AFRICAN GROUP, AOSIS, LEAST DEVELOPED COUNTRIES (LDCs), AILAC, GRUPO SUR, RUSSIAN FEDERATION, LANDLOCKED DEVELOPING COUNTRIES (LLDCs), and BRAZIL expressed their support for the SB Chairs’ proposal. The EU, UK, and NORWAY expressed their reservations about some parts of the text, and, with CANADA and JAPAN, preferred to focus discussions in informal-informals only on paragraphs pertaining to the technical taskforce.

Debates on the way forward continued into the evening.

### Finance

**Adaptation Fund:** In SBI informal consultations, Co-Facilitator Koosje Beumer-van der Loo (the Netherlands) pointed to a revised draft text which captures agreement reached to conduct the fifth review of the Fund following its transition to exclusively serve the Paris Agreement. She reported that no agreement could be reached on the other unresolved matters during a Heads of Delegation meeting convened earlier in the day. She invited Parties to agree on procedural conclusions, as follows:

- the SBI continued consideration of matters relating to the membership of the Fund’s Board, arrangements for the Fund to exclusively serve the Paris Agreement, and the initiation of the fifth review; and
- the SBI agrees to continue consideration of matters relating to the membership, transition arrangements, and the fifth review at SBI 65 on the basis of the draft text from SBI 64, noting that the text does not represent agreement among Parties and does not prejudice the number of draft decisions on these matters.

Resuming negotiations in the afternoon, the G-77/CHINA suggested alternative text to the effect that the SBI:

- continued consideration of “three items,” transition arrangements, fifth review, and Board membership;
- notes that progress has been made on matters relating to the transition arrangements and the fifth review, and that Parties have a common understanding that the relevant draft texts are clean; and
- agrees to continue consideration of the matter relating to the membership of the Adaptation Fund Board at SBI 65 on the basis of draft text from SBI 64.

Parties engaged in a lengthy debate, touching on, among others: reference to three separate “mandates,” rather than items; noting

only progress on the fifth review, which everyone agreed on, or also on the transition arrangements; removing the reference to clean text; continuing consideration of the three matters at SBI 65 on the basis of the work and progress achieved at SBI 64; and proposals for “constructive ambiguity” allowing different interpretations regarding the number of draft decisions under consideration.

After many rounds of amendments, huddles, and intermittent calls for the SBI Chair to take the matter up, Parties eventually reached agreement on the SBI conclusions.

### **Technology**

**Host of the Climate Technology Centre:** In SBI informal consultations co-facilitated by Stig Svenningsen (Norway), the G-77/CHINA proposed:

- for the SBI to recommend the UN Environment Programme (UNEP) as the host;
- including, in the draft SBI conclusions, an encouragement for UNEP to seek collaboration, cooperation, and partnerships, as appropriate, with potential partners, such as the UN Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) and UN Office for Project Services (UNOPS) and others, as relevant, with a view to leveraging the comparative advantages of these organizations; and
- removing the relevant options, in the section on UNEP’s role and responsibilities in the list of elements for the memorandum of understanding (MoU), and retain only the reference to collaboration, cooperation, and partnerships as an element for the MoU to address.

Many groups and Parties, including the LDCs, AILAC, PACIFIC-SMALL ISLAND DEVELOPING STATES (P-SIDS), EU, AFRICAN GROUP, CANADA, UK, and JAPAN, welcomed the agreement reached on the host, the elements for the MoU, and the draft conclusions. They noted that SBI 65 will consider the full MoU developed by UNEP and the Secretariat and will continue consideration of this matter on the basis of the draft decisions prepared at SBI 64.

The ARAB GROUP denounced unequal treatment in technology-related negotiations, noting lack of reflection of the Group’s textual proposals. They underscored they are not in a position to move forward on the CTC host and urged raising the matter with the SBI Chair. The other groups and Parties pleaded with the Arab Group not to jeopardize agreement on the CTC host. The ARAB GROUP underscored they do not want to block progress on the CTC host. They emphasized the need for equal treatment of technology items and for the SBI Chair to find a resolution on the CTC host, the joint annual report of the Technology Executive Committee and Climate Technology Centre and Network, and the second period assessment of support to the Technology Mechanism.

The Co-Facilitators will report to the SBI Chair that there is lack of agreement on the way forward and convey the Arab Group’s concerns.

**Linkages between the Technology Mechanism and the Financial Mechanism:** In SBI informal consultations co-facilitated by Céline Phillips (France), delegates were able to resolve outstanding disagreements. Among others, they agreed to: highlight the importance of the Green Climate Fund Updated Strategic Plan for the 2028-2031 programming cycle for the work of Technology Mechanism in the context of linkages; request the Secretariat to prepare and update information on the state of linkages; request SBI 70 (June 2029) to continue consideration of linkages with the aim of taking stock of progress and challenges

and recommend a draft decision thereon for consideration by COP 34 (November 2029); and request SBI 76 (June 2032) to recommend a draft decision on the continuation of the consideration of linkages for consideration by COP 37 (November 2032).

Parties welcomed the agreement reached on the draft conclusions, with the G-77/CHINA underscoring this is the first time in five years that progress was made on this item and the EU expressing hope for a similar spirit of compromise to manifest in the consideration of other agenda items.

### **Other Issues**

**Just Transition Work Programme (JTWP):** SB contact group Co-Chair Federica Fricano (Italy) asked if Parties could agree to a “package” of: SB conclusions; terms of reference (ToR) for the JTWP review; and an informal note that includes messages from the JTWP fifth dialogue, placeholders for the upcoming sixth dialogue and the JTWP review outcome, and an indicative list of elements for operationalizing the just transition mechanism (JTM). She explained that the informal note would be forwarded to SB 65.

The EU, LLDCs, AOSIS, AILAC, BRAZIL, and NORWAY said they could accept the package in the spirit of compromise.

On the draft conclusions, the LMDCs proposed amending the informal note to state that it does not represent a basis for further negotiations and does not prejudge further work on this issue. After some discussion, Parties accepted this text. The AFRICAN GROUP proposed text to create “additional space” at the sixth dialogue to discuss the process for operationalizing the JTM. After the EU and JAPAN raised concerns, Parties eventually agreed on a more “general” text inviting the SB Chairs to “consider informal intersessional work” prior to SB 65.

On the ToR, the LMDCs suggested amending text on inputs to inform the JTWP review. They proposed that a mapping and synthesis report on relevant instruments under the Convention, the Paris Agreement, and relevant entities in the UN to support the implementation of the JTWP “may” include “possible” areas of complementarity and coherence, rather than “should” include them. The UK and others urged Parties not to reopen discussions on the ToR, but SAUDI ARABIA said negotiations had not concluded.

After lengthy discussions failed to break the deadlock, Co-Chair Joseph Teo (Singapore) urged delegates to “save the ToR” and suggested alternative language calling for inputs to include “areas of complementarity and coherence, if any.” Parties agreed to the proposal.

Co-Chair Fricano thanked the group for agreeing on the ToR and the draft SB conclusions, and closed the contact group to a round of applause.

**Response measures:** In the SB Contact group, Co-Chair Peter Govindasamy (Singapore) introduced a third iteration of text containing draft SB 64 conclusions and an informal note capturing discussions at SB 64 and intended to serve as a basis for future work.

In the draft conclusions, Parties discussed two options for a paragraph requesting the Katowice Committee of Experts on the Impacts of the Implementation of Response Measures (KCI) to prepare a synthesis report for the technical assessment of the second Global Stocktake (GST 2). The AFRICAN GROUP, ARAB GROUP, CHILE, CHINA, and some other developing countries supported inviting submissions to inform the report and for SB 65 to consider the report with a view to requesting the KCI to submit it as input to GST 2. The UK and CANADA favored

simply requesting the KCI to prepare the report and submit it to GST 2 by February 2027.

The G-77/CHINA proposed deleting text requesting the KCI to take into account “any guidance” provided by the SB Chairs for GST 2 in the preparation of the report, suggesting there is no mandate for this. The UK, EU, CANADA and NEW ZEALAND proposed referring to the SB Chairs’ “guiding questions” for the GST 2.

On a paragraph agreeing that the SBs continue consideration of this issue at SB 65 on the basis of the informal note from SB 64, the G-77/CHINA said the informal note contains some issues that are beyond the scope of this agenda item, and proposed deleting these. Noting lack of agreement on the informal note, CANADA suggested deleting this paragraph of the draft conclusions.

Informing Parties that the contact group’s time had run out, the Co-Chairs will seek guidance from the SB Chairs.

**Research and systematic observation:** In SBSTA informal consultations co-facilitated by Frank McGovern (Ireland) and Patricia Nying’uro (Kenya), Parties continued to diverge on references to El Niño and keeping 1.5C° in reach, among others. The Co-Facilitators therefore introduced a new and shorter draft text. Many Parties expressed deep regret and frustration that so much time spent on the longer draft conclusions text had been lost, but nevertheless engaged with the Co-Facilitators’ proposal.

AOSIS insisted on deleting several paragraphs. SAUDI ARABIA said one group should not have a “veto” on the text. AOSIS noted it has “every right” to state its redlines, “just as another group has done in every other room.”

Negotiations continued into the evening.

**Action for Climate Empowerment (ACE):** In SBI informal consultations, Co-Facilitator Arne Riedel Escobar (Germany), invited views on draft conclusions.

The G-77/CHINA proposed to add: an invitation for submissions on the draft action plan; a request for the Secretariat to develop a template for submissions; and a request for the Secretariat, subject to the availability of resources, to organize a workshop in conjunction with Climate Week 4 in Azerbaijan on the role of national ACE Focal Points in supporting the implementation of the ACE Work Programme and its new action plan. With several Parties cautioning about budgetary implications, Parties eventually agreed to: invite submissions; remove the request to develop a submissions template; and point to activities under the current workplan to strengthen the capacity and skills of national ACE Focal Points and for the Secretariat to continue providing capacity-building opportunities.

On the draft conclusions, Parties also agreed to continue consideration of this matter at SBI 65 (November 2026), on the basis of the informal note from SBI 64 with a view to recommending draft decisions to COP 31 and CMA 8 (November 2026).

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

CHINA argued that its core concerns had not been addressed and, supported by the ARAB GROUP but opposed by JAPAN, proposed that Parties be “requested” instead of “invited” to review and verify the registration of their delegations and that the paragraph should also include a reference to either UN General Assembly Resolution 2758 (restoration of the lawful rights of the People’s Republic of China in the UN) or the One China principle. The UK suggested “parking” the issue pending ongoing consultations outside the room.

On efficiency of the UNFCCC process, CHINA proposed deleting text that invites Parties to consider the potential impacts of increasingly extensive agendas and the implications of their registration of Party overflow badges. SOUTH AFRICA said the current text does not acknowledge the unbalanced regional representation of observer organizations.

Parties also expressed diverging views on whether to continue discussions at SBI 65 (November 2026) or SBI 66 (June 2027). The EU, CANADA, and NEW ZEALAND supported consideration at SBI 65, while the AFRICAN GROUP and ARAB GROUP preferred SBI 66. Following a suggestion by the EIG, the incoming COP 31 Presidency of Negotiations offered to conduct, together with the incoming COP 31 Presidency, informal consultations with Parties on the efficiency of the UNFCCC process, and report back to SBI 66. The AFRICAN GROUP asked for clarity regarding the legal process for such reporting back.

The AFRICAN GROUP stressed that efficiency should not be equated with reducing budgets or removing agenda items, and, supported by the UK, proposed recognizing that the agendas and mandates within the process reflect the need to address climate change.

Following additional consultations in huddles, Parties agreed, among others, to continue discussions at SBI 66. On registration of delegates, CHINA proposed, and Parties agreed to, text requesting that Parties: nominate only legally-qualified representatives to sessions of the governing and subsidiary bodies; carefully review and verify the registration of their delegations to ensure appropriate badge management; and take measures to prevent disruption of the integrity and order of the process and negotiations.

With this, they agreed on the draft SBI conclusions.

### *In the Corridors*

Tempers frayed in several negotiation rooms as delegates frantically tried to complete their work on the many outstanding agenda items. In a few cases, things boiled over into some heated exchanges from the floor. Participants denounced “hostage-taking” or complained that others were trying to “veto” or “block” progress.

In the negotiations on research and systematic observation, small island developing states, in particular, were clearly very vexed that “we cannot agree on the science.” During a mid-day presser, a broader coalition of countries denounced “coordinated attacks across rooms, driven by fossil fuel interests.”

With regard to the Just Transition Work Programme, the Co-Chairs somehow “pulled a rabbit out of the hat” and landed, at the eleventh hour, compromise language everyone could live with. In a surprising turn of events, after a Heads of Delegation meeting yielded no progress, negotiators working on the Adaptation Fund managed not only to salvage, but even to formally note, progress. Compromises piled onto compromises to achieve this result, leaving Parties on all sides to underscore just how much this stretched their flexibility.

The many strong pleas by both developed and developing country groups did nothing to assuage the Arab Group’s stance on technology matters, however. It is now in the hands of the SBI Chair to find a way out of the stalemate. “Let’s hope we can avoid a full-blown negotiation in plenary,” said one long-time negotiator, as they braced for a difficult closing day.

The summary and analysis of the Bonn Climate Change Conference will be available on Monday, 22 June 2026 at [enb.iisd.org/bonn-climate-change-conference-sb64-sbi64-sbsta64](https://enb.iisd.org/bonn-climate-change-conference-sb64-sbi64-sbsta64)

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

English



Français



[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)

