

Parties begin work on draft text on global goal on adaptation

Dubai, 11 Dec. (Eqram Mustaqeem and Meena Raman) - With less than 48 hours before the curtains come down at COP28 in Dubai, Parties agreed on Dec 10 to work on a draft decision text on the Global Goal on Adaptation (GGA), prepared by the UAE Presidency, as the basis of work going forward for an outcome.

At the heads of delegation (HODs) meeting on the GGA, convened by COP28's Chief Executive Officer, **Adnan Amin**, he explained that "no text was forwarded" to the Presidency (following the work of the Subsidiary Bodies [SBs] from the first week of the climate talks which began on 30 Nov.) and that there were "many divergent views, both political and technical and required clear change in progress".

Amin said that in the past two days, extensive ministerial consultations were conducted led by ministers **Maisa Rojas (Chile)** and **Jennifer McAllister (Australia)** in parallel with technical consultations led by the SB Chairs, **Nabeel Munir (Pakistan)** and **Harry Vreuls (Netherlands)** on the priorities, issues and concerns of Parties.

Amin informed that the result of these consultations led to the draft text on the framework for the GGA, and called on Parties to "pick up pace" provide "sense of the overall balance and on the critical issues that need to be

improved".

Cuba, speaking for the **G77 and China** said that the text was not perfect but they are willing to engage and build on it. The first issue raised was on the timeline provided in the text for the targets were confusing and unrealistic, and could be improved by streamlining all the different timelines into a unified timeline of 2030.

(Cuba was referring to paragraph 11 in the draft text that provides as follows: "*Decides that the framework for the GGA includes the following targets in relation to the dimensions of the iterative adaptation cycle, recognizing the need to enhance adaptation action and support:*

(a) Impact, vulnerability and risk assessment: by 2025, all Parties have in place up-to-date assessments of climate hazards, climate change impacts and exposure to risks and vulnerabilities and have used these assessments to inform their formulation of national adaptation plans and nationally determined contributions; and by 2027, all Parties have established multi-hazard early warning systems and climate information services for risk reduction;

(b) Planning: by 2025, all Parties have in place country-driven, gender-responsive, participatory,

inclusive and transparent national adaptation plans, policy instruments, planning processes and/or strategies, covering, as appropriate, ecosystems, sectors, people and vulnerable communities, and have mainstreamed adaptation in all relevant strategies and plans;

(c) Implementation: by 2030, all Parties have progressed in implementing their national adaptation plans, policies and/or planning processes and, as a result, have reduced the social and economic impacts of the key climate hazards identified in the assessments referred to in paragraph 11(a) above;

(d) Monitoring, evaluation and learning: by 2030, all Parties have designed, established and operationalized a system for monitoring, evaluation and learning for their national adaptation efforts and have built the required institutional capacity to fully implement the system”.

Further, Cuba iterated that it is imperative that means of implementation (MOI) be included for developing countries to achieve those timelines and targets. It suggested a chapeau that reads *“Developed countries shall provide support including financial resources on a grant and highly concessional basis to support developing countries adaptation needs and priorities... that should be applicable to the timelines and targets.”*

Cuba also emphasised that language on MOI should be present throughout various paragraphs of the text and that it should make reference to the importance of having reporting on the support provided for the implementation of the GGA, with a standalone agenda item in the process to be established on the GGA for further work.

It also said that the whole purpose of the GGA framework is to enhance adaptive capacity of countries to face the impacts of climate change and that must be reflected.

China, for the Like-Minded Developing Countries (LMDC) noted that principle of common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities (CBDR-RC) is of critical consideration and should be in the text without any other alternative option and emphasised that strengthening adaptation action must be based on

sufficient support and MOI from developed countries. China emphasised that the developed countries should provide financial resources to assist adaptation action in developing countries in line with their obligations under the Convention and Article 9.1 of the Paris Agreement (PA).

Saudi Arabia for the Arab Group insisted on the inclusion of the principles of equity, CBDR-RC, national circumstances, priorities, and needs that take into account sustainable development and the eradication of poverty and for adaptation action to be country driven and country specific.

Columbia for the Alliance of Latin America and the Caribbean (AILAC) wanted the shortcomings of adaptation action, existence of adaptation finance gaps and the accelerated implementation of adaptation action to be a priority in the text. It also wanted all developing countries to have access to early warning systems that are to be financed through the UNFCCC’s financial mechanism and that called on developed countries to deliver in a timely and predictable manner, adaptation finance to developing countries. It viewed adaptation as a global challenge faced by all Parties and expressed preference for the language of Article 7.2 of the PA instead of the language outlined in paragraphs 27 and 33.

(Paragraphs 27 and 33 of the draft decision text have specific references to least developed countries [LDCs] and small island developing States [SIDs], while Article 7.2 does not have such particular references).

Zambia for the African Group reiterated Cuba’s view on the need to have a chapeau for the targets and timelines on the transfer of public finance from developed to developing countries on a grant and highly concessional basis and also stated that the text should note with concern that the amount of adaptation finance has decreased by 21% instead of welcoming the progress made in climate finance.

Samoa for the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS) emphasised that the GGA must encompass high level elements that are critical to accelerating adaptation action and support. It viewed the timelines for the targets as not being realistic and a mainstream target timeline of 2030 would be

better and stressed that language on MOI in the text is critical for AOSIS and that no alteration on existing MOI language should be made.

Argentina for itself **Brazil and Uruguay (ABU)**, underlined that language on MOI in the text is very weak and should be strengthened and that every target outlined in the text be complemented with language on MOI. It also stressed that the principle of CBDR should be reflected in the text in accordance with Article 7 of the PA and that it is of paramount importance for a standalone agenda on the GGA be established in the process.

Senegal for the **LDCs** indicated its preference for text on MOI that are aligned with Article 9 and 11 of the PA and that the ambitious target of enhancing adaptation should be supported by larger means of support. Senegal raised concerns over the definition of ‘transformational adaptation’ cited in the text and called for its removal and also wanted an MOI target to be included in the GGA.

Mexico for the **Environmental Integrity Group** underlined the importance of a strong political message on adaptation in the GGA and emphasised that it is important for MOI to be addressed in a broader sense in the GGA so as not to prejudge the discussions on the new collective quantified goal on climate finance (NCQG). It added that the overarching signal should be to mainstream adaptation into policy planning, especially for those who are most vulnerable.

The **Russian Federation** also made calls for a wide definition of MOI in the framework that includes financial support amongst others.

The **European Union** viewed the timeline for the targets set as unrealistic and that it posed too much of a burden on Parties. It could not support “mechanical links to targets and financial commitments that do not work in our regime”, except those which reflect the spirit of the PA. It emphasised its commitment to doubling adaptation finance while rejecting having a standalone agenda item on the GGA.

The **United States** echoed the call of the EIG in mainstreaming adaptation into development as an overarching element. It also said that we should set targets which are globally relevant and lasting.

It also said that the current text is very heavy on the MOI side and called for a balance in that regard and that it should not prejudice discussions next year (in reference to the NCQG).

It viewed the inclusion of CBDR in the text as an effort to elaborate the PA and references to the Convention which are completely outside the mandate of the text, while emphasising that it will not support any reference to CBDR in the text and preferred the “no text” option in this regard.

(The US was referring to the following options that appear in the draft text:

“Option 1: Recalling relevant provisions and principles of the Convention and the Paris Agreement, in particular, the principle of equity and common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities, in the light of different national circumstances, and Articles 9, 10 and 11 of the Paris Agreement,

Option 2: Recalling relevant provisions and principles of the Convention and the Paris Agreement,

Option 3: No text.”)

The **United Kingdom** echoed the US, as did **Japan** in this regard.

Japan opined that the reference of CBDR in the text should be deleted along with any reference to new and additional finance for adaptation, while underscoring that it is important to include a diverse source of finance from multilateral development banks and private financial institutions in the framework, and that there was too much reference on public financial support from developed to developing countries.

Norway emphasised that it is important to have realistic timelines as all countries have different starting points and thus the timeline for adaptation action should be inclusive, just and one that enables everyone to be on board. On CBDR, Norway said it recognised the importance of Article 9 of the PA (on the provision of finance) and the need to urgently scale up adaptation finance but did not support the reference to CBDR in the text.

At the end of the meeting, Amin thanked parties for

engaging and giving their views on the text and affirmed that the Presidency will take them into consideration. He encouraged Parties to submit their views in writing due to the lack of time and

said further work will continue in incorporating Parties' views in the text and find an outcome that will achieve general agreement and satisfaction.