

Decision on adaptation goal diluted due to stance of developed countries

Kathmandu, 25 Nov (Prerna Bomzan): One of the key contentious issues until the final hours of the protracted COP 27 climate talks which ended on Sunday, 20 Nov, the global goal on adaptation (GGA) ended up with a watered down decision text, due to the stance of developed countries, especially with regard to the issue of the means of implementation, which was qualified as a “consideration” and not a constituent component of the global goal.

Developing countries led by **G77 and China (Pakistan)** had firmly called for the establishment of a framework on GGA as a substantive COP 27 outcome, proposing detailed elements in the form of dimensions; themes; indicators/metrics/targets; among others. The means of implementation - finance, technology transfer and capacity building - being one of the integral components of the dimensions of the framework (See [TWN Update 7](#)).

The framework is essential to guide the GGA work programme of the second year 2023, comprising of four workshops and submissions. It is also key to guide the inputs of the assessment of progress towards the GGA under the global stocktake (GST) referenced in Article 7.14 of the Paris Agreement.

Developed countries on the other hand, led by

the **European Union (EU)**, **Switzerland**, the **United States (US)**, the **United Kingdom (UK)**, **Norway**, **Japan**, **Australia**, **Canada** and **Iceland** (See [TWN Updates 8 & 10](#)) saw the proposed framework as premature and pushed instead for a “structured approach” to developing the framework and wanted its consideration for adoption only at the next COP (COP 28) in 2023.

The structured approach referred to by the **US** primarily adhered to the approach proposed by the **EU** in the form of “adaptation policy cycle” encompassing risk and vulnerability assessments; planning; implementation; and monitoring, evaluation and learning (See in-session [EU’s submission](#)). Also, they were against means of implementation and pushed for only one of the functions of the framework as “enhancing action and support” in relation to achieving the GGA.

The firm call by the **G77/China** for a framework and with the means of implementation had been captured as options, during the evolution of the draft text: option 1 of paragraph 1 in the first iteration of the [co-facilitators’ draft text of 11 Nov](#); option 1 of paragraph 9 in the second iteration of [co-facilitators’ draft text of 15 Nov](#); and paragraph

10 (a) in the proposed [Presidency's draft text of 19 Nov.](#)

In contrast, the options of developed countries had been captured only in the [co-facilitators' draft text of 15 Nov](#) (option 2 of paragraph 9) however was firmly embedded in the [Ministers' draft text of 17 Nov](#) (paragraph 11).

Paragraph 11 of the Ministers' draft text saw the means of implementation diluted, qualified as a "consideration", reading as, "*Further decides* that the structured approach referred to in paragraph 9 above should be organized on the basis of the four steps of an iterative adaptation cycle (risk and impact assessment; planning; implementation; and monitoring, evaluation and learning) and recognizes that support, including in terms of finance, technology transfer and capacity-building, is a consideration in each stage of the cycle".

Sources told TWN that in response to the Minister's draft text, the **G77 and China** had made a submission reiterating the inclusion of means of implementation as an integral component of their proposed dimensions of the framework which was a captured option in the previous two iterations. In addition, the group did not have an agreed position on the controversial paragraph 11 given contentious reference to the structured approach and the adaptation cycle.

Paragraph 9 referenced in the draft Ministers' text also silenced the G77 and China's consistent call for the establishment of the GGA framework at COP 27, reading as, "*Decides* to initiate the development of a framework for the GGA, which will be informed by a structured approach to the Glasgow-Sharm el-Sheikh work programme in 2023, with a view to the framework being considered and adopted at the fifth session of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement [CMA 5] (November 2023)".

It is to be noted that at the Presidency's informal stocktake on 17 Nov, Minister **Aminath Shauna (Maldives)** leading the consultations with Minister **Teresa Ribera (Spain)** had reported that they had prepared a new iteration of the text "under their authority" which reflected the "best

possible balance and captures a middle ground between divergent views". Further, the said the text that would be posted for Parties to reflect on it with a spirit of "compromise" and constructive engagement in the hope to promptly achieve "consensus".

However, as seen with especially paragraphs 9 and 11, including paragraphs 10 and 12 vis-à-vis the framework, some developing country negotiators said that the [Ministers' draft text of 17 Nov](#) reflected neither balance nor middle ground. The next [Presidency's draft text of 19 Nov attempted a balance towards approaching the GGA framework as reflected by paragraphs 8, 9 and 10.](#)

Paragraph 8 read, "*Decides* to initiate the development of a framework for the GGA to be undertaken through a structured approach under the Glasgow-Sharm el-Sheikh work programme in 2023, containing the elements in para 10 below, with a view to the framework being adopted at CMA 5...".

Paragraph 10 (a) specifically included finance, capacity-building and technology transfer as a component of the dimensions of the framework referred to in paragraph 8.

Sources said that in the final late night hours of frantic negotiations on 19 Nov, it was expected that the Presidency's text, signaled as not to be reopened, would take precedence as the final decision text. However, it was learnt that the **UK** raised concerns and the text was reopened.

The next iteration proposed by the Presidency and circulated as a 'limited distribution document L.16', saw a very weak paragraph 10 on the elements of the GGA framework carrying the language "may take into consideration", from the draft Ministers' text. Further, paragraph 10 (a) reading as, ".....recognizing that support, including in terms of finance, technology transfer and capacity-building, is a consideration in each stage of the cycle". This language too reflected the contentious paragraph 11 of the draft Ministers' text.

The iteration also saw other additional language on paragraph 10 (a) and (c) imported from the draft Ministers' text, such as "nature-based

solutions” under crosscutting considerations, which is a contentious term for several countries since it is not defined under the Convention and Paris Agreement.

Thus, a considerable weak decision on the GGA was adopted (L.16/Rev 1), with the framework pushed to 2023 and a diluted means of implementation reference.

Paragraph 8 of the [adopted decision](#), reads - “Decides to initiate the development of a framework for the GGA to be undertaken through a structured approach under the Glasgow–Sharm el-Sheikh work programme in 2023, containing the elements referred to in paragraph 10 below, with a view to the framework being adopted at CMA 5 (November–December 2023)”.

In relation to the key elements of the framework, paragraph 10 reads as, “Further decides that the framework, through the structured approach referred to in paragraph 8 above, may take into consideration, inter alia:

(a) Dimensions (iterative adaptation cycle): impact, vulnerability and risk assessment; planning; implementation; and monitoring, evaluation and learning; recognizing that support in terms of finance, capacity-building and technology transfer is a consideration in each stage of the cycle;

(b) Themes: water; food and agriculture; cities, settlements and key infrastructure; health; poverty and livelihoods; terrestrial and freshwater ecosystems; and oceans and coastal ecosystems; tangible cultural heritage; mountain regions; and biodiversity;

(c) Cross-cutting considerations: country-driven, gender-responsive, participatory and fully transparent approaches, human rights approaches, intergenerational equity and social justice, taking into consideration vulnerable groups, communities and ecosystems, and nature-based solutions, and based on and guided by the best available science including science-based indicators, metrics and targets, as appropriate, traditional knowledge, knowledge of indigenous peoples and local knowledge systems, ecosystem-based adaptation, nature-based solutions, community-based adaptation, disaster

risk reduction and intersectional approaches with a view to integrating adaptation into relevant socioeconomic and environmental policies and actions, where appropriate;

(d) Sources of information including those referred to in decision 19/CMA.1, paragraph 37, namely:

(i) Reports and communications from Parties, in particular those submitted under the Paris Agreement and the Convention;

(ii) The latest reports of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change;

(iii) Reports of the subsidiary bodies;

(iv) Reports from relevant constituted bodies and forums and other institutional arrangements under or serving the Paris Agreement and/or the Convention;

(v) The synthesis reports by the secretariat referred to in paragraph 23 of that decision;

(vi) Relevant reports from United Nations agencies and other international organizations, which should be supportive of the UNFCCC process;

(vii) Voluntary submissions from Parties, including on inputs to inform equity considerations under the global stocktake;

(viii) Relevant reports from regional groups and institutions;

(ix) Submissions from non-Party stakeholders and UNFCCC observer organizations”.

Further, in the finals hours of negotiations, sources who spoke to TWN said that the **US** as well as the **UK**, also raised concerns in relation to the draft text of the CMA cover decision, specifically paragraph 38 of the section (V) on adaptation, which read as, “Stresses the urgency to fulfil the mandate of having a clear GGA to guide the effective implementation of Article 7 of the Paris Agreement”.

Some developing countries were pushing for a more “clear” GGA given Article 7.1 of the Paris Agreement encompassed only components or elements but not a clear goal as such. However, the developed countries did not want to clarify or define the goal.

Paragraph 38 of the final [adopted CMA cover decision](#) called the ‘Sharm el-Sheikh Implementation Plan’ reads, “Stresses the urgency of fulfilling the mandate of having a clear

framework for the GGA to guide the effective implementation of Article 7 of the Paris Agreement”.