SCF 40 Meeting: June 19-20, 2026; Bonn, Germany

Notes submitted by: Bentje Böer, ETH Zürich, Switzerland (in person participation)

Overview

Co-Chairs: Elena Cristina Pereira Colindres (Honduras) and Vicky Noens (Belgium)
Tasks: The SCF has to prepare two reports this year and at the same time begins to plan how to prepare and deliver the upcoming five reports in 2028.

- Reviewing and commenting on the two reports, the 7th Biennial Assessment report and the third report on progress towards achieving the 100 bn goal
- Discussing proposals to structure the workload ahead of 2028
- Reviewing the agenda for the 2026 Forum
- Agreeing on a theme for the 2027 Forum

Notes by Agenda Item

3. (a) 2026 Forum of the Standing Committee on Finance
Co-facilitators: Isobel Bartholomew (UK), Davi Bonavides (Brazil)

The Co-facilitators presented a draft agenda of the forum which will focus on Water and Oceans, including a more interactive format with several breakout groups and panel discussions which found broad support among members. Only slight changes were proposed, including a more private sector friendly language to attract private sector participants (Switzerland), sectoral approaches to make impact more practically relevant (Philippines), and a comprehensive program including knowledge sharing across all climate goals (Uganda, Honduras) and public and private finance (Uganda). Both the Philippines (currently a member of the SCF) and Australia (currently an observer) expressed their hope that regional expertise on the forum's topic of Water and Ocean would be appropriately reflected.

Following this first discussion, the co-facilitators integrated three edits into the agenda which were reversed on the second day as they would have led to more substantive discussion and the agenda had to be agreed upon that day. The co-facilitators promised to take all comments into account when finalizing the agenda and inviting speakers.

Australia and the Philippines in partnership with the Pacific Islands offered to host the Forum in Sydney, Australia. Members supported the venue but stressed that visa accommodations should be made by the Australian Government and that the framework arrangement should be finalized soon by the UNFCCC secretariat and the Australian Government.

3. (b) Theme for the 2027 Forum of the Standing Committee on Finance
Co-facilitators: Isobel Bartholomew (UK), Davi Bonavides (Brazil)

The discussion on a forum topic for the 2027 forum was heated and soon ended in deadlock. The representative of the European Union and other European countries strongly advocated for an energy focus, the representative of the Arab Group strongly opposed any mention of energy in the forum title and requested that the EU's Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism, reverse flows from developing to developed countries and unilateral trade measures would be in the title, too, if energy were mentioned. Through coffee breaks and informal conversations, the Swiss delegate was able to reach a compromise, which was accepted on the second day. The title will only mention "Investments and financing of climate technology innovation" while the description specifies that the forum will discuss the topic across sectors, including (amongst others) the energy sector. Both title and description have been agreed on. Further discussions on engaging with stakeholders were postponed in light of time pressure and the heated atmosphere. Several delegates indicated interest in hosting the Forum and adjacent SCF meeting, including Germany and Rwanda.

4. Seventh Biennial Assessment and Overview of Climate Finance Flows
Co-facilitators: Karima Oustadi (Austria) & Tamim Alothimin (Saudi Arabia)

The first session on the 7th Biennial Assessment Report (BA) started with a presentation by the responsible consultants giving an overview of the progress since the last SCF meeting. They highlighted expanded sections on green budget tagging, green finance taxonomies and the methods for capturing Art. 2.1.c related flows. Only four countries have submitted preliminary Biennial Transparency Report 2 data. Climate Policy Initiative and Oxfam are expected to share their latest data and analyses before the end of June 2026.

Many members had comments on the draft, ranging from high level notes on the key messages (e.g., Uganda stressing that the key message should be that there is a huge gap between climate finance needs and actual climate finance flows) and general language (eventually everyone agreed that the language should be as objective as possible) to introducing new sections (Namibia proposing a section on reverse flows) and separating methodological subsections from substantive ones (Philippines).

Methodologies played a large role, as the draft also considered possible NCQG methodologies. The Philippines and Switzerland for example showed interest in a more detailed description of methodologies used by the private sector and how private sector provided data differs from public sector provided data. Russia mentioned that the aspect of transition finance could be expanded, especially as relating to finance taxonomies. Furthermore, some key data providers (the Joint Multilateral Development Banks (MDBs) and the International Development Finance Club) expanded their adaptation methodology to capture more sectors. One discussion centered on MDBs only providing aggregate data by income level of their recipients. Several delegates were interested in discerning and learning more about those recipients which qualify as developing under the UNFCCC but are high income countries according to the World Bank. Flows to these countries will not be reflected in the Biennial Assessment when referring to MDB data. Other delegates misunderstood this discussion as introducing new categories (namely income classes) into the Biennial Assessment report and requested to stick with the Annex I vs Non-Annex I differentiation.

Quality of climate finance was another topic several delegates mentioned. Uganda for example requested a stronger focus on the grant share of finance provided, the debt sustainability issue and a stronger separation of public and private finance mobilized, as well as consideration of equity, climate and gender justice. Switzerland asked for more information on how the proliferation of funds affected accessibility of funding.

Members agreed that the co-facilitators as well as the team from the secretariat should integrate comments by the next meeting when they would also discuss the draft executive summary.

5. Third report on progress towards achieving the goal of mobilizing jointly USD 100 billion per year to address the needs of developing countries in the context of meaningful mitigation actions and transparency on implementation

Co-facilitators: Martin Stadelmann (Switzerland) & Amjad Abdulla (Maldives)

While generally similar points were raised as for the 7th BA, discussions overall were shorter for this third report on progress towards achieving the 100 bn goal. Several members (e.g., Germany, UK) announced that they would send written comments as they had not yet had the time to fully read the draft. Some delegates (e.g., Uganda) noted that only four data sources formed the basis of analysis to which the consultants responded that they focused on the few universal sources. Some members requested a fuller reflection on lessons learned, such as difficulties in accessing funds. Observer Kenya asked for more detail on how public finance mobilized private finance, how Biennial Transparency Reports can be used to triangulate information and how much finance was delivered across all years since the announcement of the 100 bn goal. Kenya's delegate also asked whether this was the last 100 bn report and SCF members replied that there would be at least one more covering 2025 financial flows.

6. Strategic planning for mandated reports of the Standing Committee on Finance in 2028

The SCF will have to deliver five reports in 2028 and the co-chairs thus initiated a discussion on how to efficiently manage the workload. The SCF discussed whether some reports may be delivered in a different format (not following the BA format), potentially hosting information common to all reports (such as methodologies and underlying raw data) on the website of the UNFCCC, and how to adjust the timing of the publications to reach policymakers better. The delegate from Antigua and Barbuda also mentioned that information by the SCF should be the authoritative information cited by LLMs to actually reach users and that this would require information to be provided in an AI friendly way. Some members wanted to postpone discussions on the workplan until after the Review of Modalities, Procedures and Guidelines (MPGs) scheduled before 2028.

Some of the changes proposed are especially relevant for the RINGO constituency: The co-chairs proposed a joint call for evidence for the 2028 reports (there seemed to be no objection by members), increasing visibility of contributions in the reports to attract more submissions to the calls of evidence and the potential publication of raw data already mentioned above. None of these changes were formally agreed at this meeting.

There was some discussion on the proposals, including the question of format and whether shorter formats could keep the same level of information as Biennial Assessment formatted reports. Especially non-Annex I countries feared that information may be lost in shorter formats. Annex I delegates were more split, with some proposing short formats and more information hosted permanently and visually attractive (e.g., Canada, Russia) on the website and others conveying their appreciation of the reports as compendia of knowledge and as evidence base (EU). Several delegates (most prominently Philippines) also stressed that the reports served different purposes and should thus not be conflated too easily.

Members agreed that they should continue to plan their workload for 2028 efficiently while staying flexible to accommodate any new mandates and changing preferences.