

Disagreements halt progress on the global goal on adaptation

Dubai, 8 Dec (Eqram Mustaqeem) - The two year Glasgow-Sharm el-Sheikh Work Programme on the Global Goal on Adaptation (GlaSS - GGA) is scheduled to conclude at CMA5 this year, after 8 technical workshops and Parties are to agree on a framework on the GGA.

However, after five rounds of informal consultations, disagreements between Parties on the two iterations of the draft decision texts provided by the co-facilitators **Mattias Frumerie (Sweden)** and **Janine Felson (Belize)** on Dec 6, concluded with Parties failing to reach a consensus on a text for the framework, bringing the GGA work to a standstill. Many developing countries were unhappy that the texts produced were not balanced and did not properly reflect their positions.

Given that the GGA informal consultations failed to reach a consensus on the way forward under the Subsidiary Bodies (SBs), the matter is now passed on to the COP 28 Presidency, who is also presiding over CMA5, to take the appropriate action on the way forward.

The consequent way forward will be determined and announced by the COP28 Presidency at the resumption of the CMA plenary morning of Dec 8, when the climate talks enter the second week.

Below is a brief summary on what transpired under the informal consultations on the GGA during the first week of the talks.

On 2 Dec. at the first round of informal consultations, **Suriname**, on behalf of the **G77 and China** emphasised that developed countries have historically emitted most of the greenhouse gas emissions which is driving climate change today. Developing countries in contrast, despite emitting less, suffer from the adverse impacts brought by climate change. It also stressed that the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities (CBDR-RC) recognizes this fact and hence should be the fundamental principle that guides the GGA framework.

Suriname specifically stressed the urgency of ensuring the provision of financial resources for adaptation from developed countries to developing countries and that it is paramount that finance be mobilised in an adequate, predictable and accessible manner that would allow developing countries to implement effective adaptation measures.

It quoted the 2023 Adaptation Gap Report that places the financing gap for adaptation between USD194 and 366 billion per year and stated

that even with the doubling of adaptation finance by 2025, this would only reduce the gap by 5-10%, further underscoring the need for a drastic increase in adaptation finance from developed countries.

Suriname further emphasised that the provision of financial resources should be part of the means of implementation (MOI) within the GGA framework that also encompasses technology transfer and capacity-building support. It stressed further that for the framework to be successful, MOI needs to be included in three ways, as a standalone section, as part of the guiding principles and as an overarching target of the framework.

Suriname further stated that moving forward, further work on the GGA should include the development of indicators and the establishment of a new joint agenda item under the Subsidiary Bodies on matters related to the GGA and that further work on this crucial issue can be better reflected through the establishment of a new standalone agenda item.

Saudi Arabia for the **Arab Group**, **Argentina** for itself, **Brazil and Uruguay (ABU)**, **Botswana** for the **African Group**, **Lesotho** for the **Least Developed Countries (LDCs)**, **Panama** for **Alliance of Latin America and the Caribbean (AILAC)** and **China** for the **Like-Minded Developing Countries (LMDC)** all delivered interventions concurring of that with Suriname.

The **European Union (EU)** explicitly stated that they do not see MOI as being part of the framework, instead highlighting the important role of multilateral development banks (MDBs), international financial institutions (IFI) and the private sector and their inclusion in the framework to deliver adaptation finance.

The first informal consultations ended with a request by Suriname to not give the mandate to the co-facilitators to develop the text until Parties have had time to reflect and coordinate on what has been said, noting that it will be open to consider giving the mandate at the next session

On 3 Dec. at the second informal consultations, Parties reiterated their position on the GGA framework with all blocs in the G77 and China again stressing the importance of MOI in the GGA

framework and agreed to give the mandate to the co-facilitators to develop a text. **China** for the **LMDC** emphasised that the text should be a compilation of the positions of Parties and not just a highlight of the points of convergence.

At the third informal consultations on 4 Dec. all Parties were in consensus that the first iteration of the draft decision text provided by the co-facilitators did not reflect their respective positions and noted how they were not able to properly review the text due time constraints.

Saudi Arabia for the **Arab Group** regarded the text as imbalanced and called for a new text that compiles the positions of all Parties. **Argentina** for **ABU** reiterated that the mandate given was to compile the views of all Parties and regretted how MOI was not included as part of the GGA framework in the text and echoed Saudi Arabia's call for a new text that compiles the positions of all Parties. **Panama** for **AILAC** stated that the text was imbalanced and that the views of developing countries were not adequately considered, specifically on matters regarding MOI.

China for the **LMDC** stated that the text ignored the positions of developing countries despite Parties having repeatedly asserted that the text should be a compilation capturing all views, not only on the points of convergence or agreement and called for a new text to be developed accordingly and expressed concerns on how the CBDR-RC wording was bracketed in the text.

Botswana for the **African Group** noted with concern how the provided text did not capture all views and made extensive examples on how the text failed to capture their position.

The developed countries whilst expressing their disappointment with the text that failed to reflect their views, were of the opinion that Parties should engage in the current text instead of a new one.

At the end of the session, the co-facilitators declared that they will be drafting a second iteration of the text.

On 5 Dec. at the fourth informal consultations, Parties stated that they were not able to properly review the second iteration of the text provided by

the co-facilitators due to it being submitted less than two hours before the consultations started.

Saudi Arabia for the **Arab Group** requested that Parties only give general views without engaging into the details of the text as they had not gotten the opportunity to review the text due to time constraints.

The interventions made by Parties then only touched on generalities of the GGA framework and did not go into the specifics of the text.

On the fifth and final informal consultations on 6 Dec. after Parties have had adequate time to review

the second iteration of the text, the room was fragmented between Parties who wanted to engage with the text and Parties who wanted to give the mandate to the co-facilitators to draft a new text compiling the submissions from all Parties.

As Parties could not come to a consensus and the allocated time had been exhausted, the co-facilitators had to conclude the session and report to the SB Chairs that there was no consensus in the room.

Whether and how further progress on this issue remains to be seen in week two of the Dubai negotiations.