



# TWN

**BONN CLIMATE NEWS UPDATE**  
PUBLISHED BY THIRD WORLD NETWORK

# 10

1 July  
2025

## Key issues on mitigation talks deferred to COP30 in Brazil

New Delhi, July 1 (Radhika Chatterjee) - At the recently concluded climate talks in Bonn, Germany on June 26, Parties adopted a procedural outcome for the 'Sharm-el-Sheikh Mitigation Ambition and Implementation Work Programme' (MWP), deferring the key issues to be decided at COP 30 in Belem, Brazil later this year.

Taking note of an [informal note](#) produced by co-facilitators **Ursula Fuentes (Germany)** and **Maesela John Kekana (South Africa)** under their "own responsibility", Parties agreed to continue further consideration of matters on the MWP at the 63<sup>rd</sup> session of the UNFCCC's Subsidiary Bodies (SB63) (to be held in November this year), and adoption of a decision at COP30.

Spread over eight informal consultations, the MWP discussions focused on three key things: what would be required to make the discussions a "safe space" [See [TWN update](#) for details], the digital platform that was first proposed at COP 29 by **Brazil** on behalf of **Group SUR** (for facilitating the implementation of mitigation) and the structure of the draft decision that would be further considered at the next SB session and COP30. Discussions over the structure of the draft decision, held mostly during the second week of the SB sessions, were the most contentious ones. A couple of informal consultations were also

devoted to discussions over the digital platform.

The key areas of divergence on the structure of the draft decision amongst Parties included: whether to include any high-level political messages and actionable recommendations from the fifth and sixth global dialogues; whether there should be any linkage between the MWP and Parties' nationally determined contributions (NDCs), especially including a reference to the NDC synthesis report (which is expected to be published by the UNFCCC's secretariat prior to COP 30) and making NDCs aligned to the 1.5 °C goal; whether to take up further consideration of the digital platform under MWP or not, and whether to review and discuss continuation of MWP after 2026.

A main bone of contention led by **developed countries** and supported by the **Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS)**, **Independent Alliance of Latin American and Caribbean States (AILAC)** and the **Least Developed Countries (LDCs)** is that since COP 29 last year, their calls for the MWP to be the vehicle to implement the outcomes from the first global stocktake (GST) through "high-level messages", has not been possible, especially that relating to paragraph 28 of the GST decision (on global mitigation efforts in relation to energy, including

**TWN**  
Third World Network

Third World Network is an independent non-profit international research and advocacy organization involved in bringing about a greater articulation of the needs, aspirations and rights of the peoples in the South and in promoting just, equitable and ecological development.

Address 131, Jalan Macalister, 10400, Penang, MALAYSIA.

Tel 60-4-2266728/2266159 Fax 60-4-2264505

E-mail [tw@twnetwork.org](mailto:tw@twnetwork.org) Website <https://twn.my/>

the transitioning away from fossil fuels).

Further, developed countries like the **European Union (EU)**, **Environmental Integrity Group (EIG)**, **United Kingdom (UK)**, **Australia**, **Norway**, **South Korea**, along with some developing countries like **AOSIS**, the **AILAC**, and **LDCs** wanted to discuss high level political messages from the fifth global dialogue, include a reference to the NDC synthesis report and aligning NDCs to the 1.5 °C goal. They insisted on keeping in mind the “urgency” of the situation. They also stressed the need for discussing the assessment of the MWP and its continuation after 2026. They expressed reluctance for having further discussions on the digital platform and a possible decision towards its establishment at COP30 because they felt setting up such a platform would be a complex task and they were not able to see what “value add” the platform would bring to raising mitigation ambition under MWP. They also said that setting up the platform at a global level would be beyond the mandate and duration of the MWP.

On the other hand, several developing country groupings and Parties including the **Like-minded Developing Countries (LMDC)**, the **African Group**, and the **Arab Group** stressed the need for ensuring that the nature of any political or high-level messages included in the informal note should be “non-prescriptive, non-punitive and facilitative” (referred to as the mandate of the MWP), and that it should not impose any targets on countries.

On the issue of linking the MWP to NDCs and making NDCs aligned to the 1.5 °C goal, **India** said that it was “almost impossible” to look at the alignment of individual NDCs to the 1.5 °C goal because “NDCs were national in nature, while the temperature goal was global” adding that if at all NDCs alignment to the temperature goal has to be looked at, it will have to be done in accordance with the principles of CBDR and equity.

Further, developing countries including the **LMDC**, **African Group**, **Arab Group**, **India**, **Egypt**, **South Africa** and **Ghana** also stressed that the need for references to the principles of the Convention, the Paris Agreement (PA) and the mandate of the MWP. In particular, they wanted to include reference to the principles of equity and CBDR.

They expressed a keenness to focus on discussing further improvements to the global dialogues and investment focused events (IFE) held under MWP. The **African Group** wanted to discuss ways by which the ‘pitch-hub’ events under MWP could be brought back. They stressed the important matchmaking role played by the ‘pitch-hub’ events in connecting donors to project proponents and also highlighted the potential role that the digital platform could play towards this, thus helping developing countries to scale up implementation of mitigation ambition.

Several developing country groupings including the **LMDC**, **African Group** and **Arab Group** also pointed out that as per the mandate of MWP, the continuation of MWP is to be till 2026 (before the adoption of a decision on further extension) and not 2025. **Egypt** said any attempt to bring forward that discussion to 2025 would amount to changing the mandate of MWP.

[The MWP [decision 4/CMA.4](#) adopted in 2022 states that *“the work programme shall be operationalized through focused exchanges of views, information and ideas, noting that the outcomes of the work programme will be non-prescriptive, non-punitive, facilitative, respectful of national sovereignty and national circumstances, take into account the NDCs and will not impose new targets or goals”*. The MWP is supposed to continue its work till 2026 before the adoption of a decision on further extension of the work.]

[It is to be noted that the informal-note from the SB62 session in Bonn states that *“The co-facilitators would like to highlight that the objective of the Sharm el-Sheikh mitigation ambition and implementation work programme shall be to urgently scale up mitigation ambition and implementation in this critical decade in a manner that complements the GST.”* The informal-note also in a footnote reflects the mandate of the MWP as being “non-prescriptive, non-punitive and facilitative”.]

## HIGHLIGHTS OF KEY INTERVENTIONS

**China** for the **LMDC** said it would like to see principles of the Convention and the PA, and the mandate of MWP reflected in the preamble part of the informal note. In the context of the IFEs, it

highlighted the digital platform and said “the digital platform is born from the IFEs” which are trying to link investment with mitigation projects. It rejected the idea of discussing next steps for MWP and its continuation and said “there is no value add [in that]...this decision [referring to the decision to be adopted in Brazil] is about the current mandate of MWP. The timeframe [of MWP] for us is 2023-2026.” It said next steps should be discussed in 2026 after the conclusion of the programme and right now the discussion should be focused on COP30 which will happen in 2025. It said discussions on improvements on modalities of MWP should focus on the global dialogues and IFEs, and the advancement of the digital platform. It said it did not see value in linking MWP to NDCs. Expressing confusion about reflecting messages for the new NDCs (which are the next set of NDCs from 2031-2035), China said, “we are still in the first implementation period of the first NDCs (2021-2030), the second NDC will cover the period 2031 onwards. [We] don’t see the value and logic of what we discuss here, and what will be reflected”.

**Saudi Arabia** for the **Arab Group** said it would like to see a reference to principles of the PA, equity, and CBDR in the preambular section of the decision structure. It asked for the deletion of reference to continuation of the work programme in the informal note as that is something “that has to be discussed in 2026.” It also asked for placeholders for representing any key messages from the global dialogues and IFEs of this year. It said discussions related to the improvement of MWP would relate to the digital platform.

**Zimbabwe** for the **African Group** said the preamble of the decision could recall principles, including CBDR, highlight science, objectives and mandate of MWP. It stressed in particular the need for keeping in mind the non-prescriptive, non-punitive and facilitative nature of MWP’s mandate. It asked for a discussion on improvement of the work programme instead of focusing on “improvements to the implementation of MWP”. It highlighted the need for bringing back pitch hub events in the IFEs held under MWP [the fifth IFE did not organize a pitch hub event, marking a departure from previous year’s IFEs] to facilitate matchmaking of finance with mitigation project implementors. It expressed an openness for

continuing further discussion on the digital platform with a view to understand its aims, purpose, objective and what the “platform would look like”. **South Africa** and **Ghana** shared views similar to the AGN.

**Egypt** expressed disagreement with the including a reference to the NDC synthesis report in the informal note as that “is outside the mandate and modalities of MWP.” Adding, it said, “we continuously explained (that the) outcome of the MWP is not prescriptive. We don’t agree with any prescription to be provided under MWP.” On the issue of the continuation of the work program, it said “we heard views of Parties on alternatives to what the MWP should be doing. We interpret this that some Parties are thinking of changing the mandate, which is not welcomed or acceptable.”

On the advancement of the digital platform, it said that “attempts to destroy any advancements with a tool that would be useful for developing countries is not really welcomed”. It believed that “many groups only care about key messages on paper and achieving wins in the negotiations, and not really caring about achieving results on the ground. The MWP can be a powerful tool for facilitating real action on the ground but unfortunately, it seems that this is either not understood until now or there is no willingness to understand the real benefits that the MWP can bring.” It added further that “attempts to push the action on the ground to the action agenda under initiatives outside of the (UNFCCC/PA) process is not welcomed, as this shows the real intention to only have the MWP as a place for putting more pressure on Parties through political messages instead of providing advancing a tool which would advance real action on the ground. Implementation of action is the objective of the UNFCCC and the PA.”

**India** said the MWP should be reviewed in 2026 and that “there is no basis to discuss the future right now.” Responding to the proposal of aligning NDCs to 1.5 °C goal, it said it was “almost impossible” to look at the alignment of individual NDCs to the 1.5 °C goal because NDCs were national in nature, while the temperature goal was global. It said if at all NDCs alignment to the temperature goal has to be looked at, it will have to be done in accordance with the principles of CBDR and equity. Adding further, it said, “there can be no direction

that can be provided for NDCs, [rather] we are to learn from MWP for our NDCs.” It said “giving any directive for our NDCs will be outside the mandate of MWP and the PA.” Responding to the calls for including references to the best available science, it said it was not in favour of that given the “divergent views on what should be conveyed from science” and the fact that “MWP is not the space for opening a discussion on science, which is happening in other rooms.” It said it was too early to include any key messages from the fifth and sixth global dialogues in the informal note in the absence of dialogue reports.

**Brazil** said there is significant interest for the digital platform on how it could apply to the task of facilitating mitigation action and said it is a “tool to enhance mitigation action” and that its functionalities needed further discussion. It said the digital platform offered “multiple possibilities” and that there is a need for discussing matters related to the platform’s governance, functions, and piloting it. Regarding governance it said the question of who should be able to access features of the platform needs to be addressed. It pointed out that the technical issues related to the digital platform are “not intuitive to non-technology people” and there is a need to have further discussions on it. It said the digital platform “does not replace the global dialogues and IFEs”. Rather, the platform would be provide for “true cooperation” amongst countries, actors on ground and financial stakeholders.

**Bolivia** said the digital platform could be an important tool if Parties are able to create something that can address concerns related to enhancing ambition of mitigation action. It said in the context of the PA there is a need for “not only mitigation centric perspective” but to address mitigation and adaptation together. This understanding is based on Article 6.8 of the PA which refers to non market approaches. It said the digital platform could be a tool to strengthen the web based platform that has been set up under Article 6.8 and to make it more dynamic so that Parties can include non-market approaches in the implementation of their NDCs.

**Samoa** for **AOSIS** said it would like to see references to the latest available science as that was the foundation of MWP’s mandate. It asked for

the need to reflect a commitment by Parties to the 1.5 °C goal as that is something that the small island states need to stay alive. It also asked for the implementation of paras 28 (on ‘transitioning away from fossil fuels’) and 33 (addressing deforestation) of the GST at COP30 and inclusion of a reference to the NDC synthesis report. It said the decision should also reflect a message to Parties preparing their NDCs for 2030 and 2035 to submit new and updated NDCs that are aligned to the 1.5 °C goal. Highlighting the importance of discussing the continuation of the work programme, it said, “this is a critical section to be included [in the draft decision structure] in line with the timeline of the work programme” and that Parties need wait till 2026 to begin this discussion. It also asked the secretariat to prepare a technical paper to assist Parties to deliberate on MWP and consider its outcomes on mitigation, finance, technology, and capacity building.

Expressing its wariness towards the digital platform, AOSIS said it “remains unclear to us what problem the digital platform is trying to solve. How will it address meaningfully the needs of small island development states?” It said the aim of integrating national platforms with the digital platform through interoperability would “take years” and that “MWP cannot be the right place to continue discussions and develop the platform”. It suggested this was something that could be taken by Brazil as a Presidency initiative to get “seek greater buy in” for the platform.

**Colombia** for **AILAC** raised concerns about the “few results” that MWP has “yielded” and asked for a discussion on improving opportunities under MWP in line with its mandate and to “ensure coherence with outcomes of the GST”. It supported the idea of including key messages for implementation of mitigation ambition from the global dialogues, and also asked for including a reference to the 1.5 °C goal in the context of raising mitigation ambition. It said there is a need to discuss continuation of the work programme after 2026. Regarding the implementation of the MWP, it said “improvements should not only be limited to the organization of the global dialogues and IFEs” but that they must also focus on the “effectiveness” of MWP. On the issue of the digital platform, it said consensus is “not there on moving forward with the digital platform for MWP”. It said expansion of



the digital platform beyond areas of mitigation could be discussed “separately” as a Presidency initiative and that the “platform discussion has drawn [Parties] away from MWP’s key objective.”

**Bangladesh** for **LDCs** said it would like to include reference to the NDC synthesis report in the draft decision structure. It said MWP is the “only agenda item dedicated to mitigation” and is the only space where Parties can talk about “mitigation ambition” and implementation of the next round of NDCs. It said “some decisions that were taken last year should be considered again in terms of improvement of the process and should be taken into consideration next year.” It highlighted the need for discussing continuation of the work programme and said Parties “should have a clear understanding” of “what to do with the work programme after 2026.” And suggested that Parties should be invited to submit their views in addressing the question of whether to continue MWP beyond 2026 or not.

**EU** said it was important to have a discussion on key messages from the global dialogues and the high-level roundtable ministerial meeting on mitigation. It pointed out the need for referencing urgency, 1.5 °C goal, best available science, NDC synthesis report, and improvement of MWP itself. It stressed the need for discussing continuation of the work programme as that would “inform necessary scale of ambition” in the future. It also said there was a need to explore potential synergies with other work programmes like the Just Transition Work Programme to improve the outputs of the global dialogues. It asked for deleting the reference to the digital platform from the informal note and said “the aim of this platform is addressing much larger things than can be addressed by the scope of MWP.” It can therefore be addressed “outside of MWP” and would need engagement of a wide range of stakeholders to “increase mitigation action on ground.”

**Switzerland** for **EIG** said there is a need for delivering “concrete and actionable outcomes in

COP30”, especially in the context of reversing deforestation by 2030. It said “this cannot be substituted by the digital platform.” It asked for the inclusion of key messages from the fifth global dialogue with a placeholder for key recommendations from the sixth global dialogue. It said it “would like to see actionable recommendations so we move from negotiation to implementation.” It added the need for including a reference to “next steps” aimed at improvement and review of MWP in the decision structure. It said it would like to see a reference to the relevance of topics that are discussed in this year’s global dialogues for Parties upcoming NDCs and added, “we could have a simple invitation for Parties to consider best practices of global dialogues during the preparation of their NDCs.”

**UK** said that there should be some space for including a reference to the general context of “what MWP should achieve through its outcomes.” It supported the idea of including key messages in the decision structure and asked for the inclusion of a reference to continuation of work under MWP.

**Australia** asked for including language related to 1.5 °C goal and a placeholder for key messages from the dialogues. It said messages related to finance and means of implementation should include a reference to diverse range of funding instruments ranging from public, private and blended instruments. It said the decision should have “next steps section” in which continuation of the programme is discussed. It said there is “nothing in the mandate that precludes” Parties from having that discussion in 2025. Expressing skepticism towards the digital platform, it said, “the more we hear, more we feel this is not suited to be operationalized within this work programme” and asked for a different setting like a separate agenda item or Presidency’s action agenda to take forward work related to the digital platform.

**New Zealand, Japan, South Korea, and Norway** shared views similar to those of the EU and EIG.