

Developed countries use of remaining carbon space must be reversed - says G77/China

Dubai, 1 Dec. (Meena Raman) – At the launch of the Dubai climate talks held on 30 Nov. developing countries led by the **G77 and China** called on developed countries “who bear the greatest responsibility for the modification of the global climate system” to reverse course, “in their accelerated consumption of the remaining carbon space”.

In a similar vein, the **BASIC group (Brazil, China, India and South Africa)** expressed concern that “there has been a significant increase in the production and consumption of fossil fuels by developed countries in recent years and encouraged developed countries to take the lead in phasing-out their own fossil fuel production and consumption, in an accelerated manner”.

Ambassador Pedro Luis Pedrosa Cuesta of **Cuba**, speaking for the **G77 and China** said that “the latest Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) report is clear when signaling that if current emission trends continue we will not be able to keep the temperature goal of 1.5°C within reach with the ghastly implications that this would have to the life on the planet”. He added that “the most recent analysis and data exposing the growing gap in emissions cuts of major developed countries compared to their emission reduction commitments not only confirm the above, but

even more importantly reveal that those who bear the greatest historical responsibility for the modification of the global climate system are accelerating consuming the remaining of the carbon space”. (The full statement of the G77/China was made available to TWN).

“If we do not reverse this trend”, said the statement, “we will see the chances for the developing countries achieving the sustainable development significantly reduced, our livelihoods seriously at risk and the global inequality gap widening.”

“All this is taking place in a wider context. As the recent Summit on the sustainable development goals demonstrated, we are far behind of reaching the targets that we collectively set to achieve for 2030. The impact of the pandemic in food and energy security; the unfair and restrictive measures introduced by our developed partners in the area of trade, exorbitantly increasing the cost of developing countries exports to those markets; the serious decline in multilateral development assistance and the failure of developed countries to fulfill their commitments for the provision of the support needed by developing countries to undertake on multilateral agreements, to mention just a few, reflect a very dire scenario

for the countries of the global south”.

Cuba also expressed regret “that the second replenishment of the Green Climate Fund (GCF) resulted in a lower amount of total pledges from developed countries, compared to the previous replenishment as well as unfulfilled pledges from the previous period– we are moving backwards in this critical juncture, rather than forwards.”

Loss and Damage

The G77 and China welcomed the adoption of the decision on the Loss and Damage Fund and “looked forward to a quick start-up of the fund and to its capitalisation, by developed countries, especially through grant-based contributions, commensurate with the scale of the loss and damage sustained by developing countries”.

Global Stocktake (GST)

“To have strong and substantive decision on the GST is a priority for the Group”, said the statement, adding that it must be “in accordance with the principles of equity and common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities (CBDR-RC), in the light of different national circumstances, for achieving our common objective of enhancing the collective ambition of action and support and international cooperation under the Paris Agreement”.

“We also need a concrete signal from developed countries that they are committed to course correct and to take the lead in filling the ambition and implementation gaps. The GST outcome should be informed by an assessment of the gaps and failure of implementation, including ensuring the means of implementation in the period prior to 2020” said the statement further.

For the G77 and China, said the statement, it is critical for the enhancing of action and support “to be in the context of promoting sustainable development, poverty eradication and economic diversification, taking into account the needs of developing countries in terms of sustainable development and just transitions. The outcomes should inform new nationally determined

contributions (NDCs) in an effective way”.

The statement also said that “a key message for the GST is that response measures within the process should study, assess and address the implications of all discussed policies of countries’ societies and economies. In a context when we are all doing efforts to increase our climate action, it’s an issue of serious concern the growing impact of unilateral economic coercive measures on the capacity and ability of developing countries to meet their obligations under the Convention and the Paris Agreement”.

Adaptation

The G77 also stressed the need “to adopt a robust and integral Global Goal on Adaptation (GGA) framework that takes into account equity and CBDR-RC, sustainable development, as well as different national circumstances, needs and priorities of developing countries” adding that the GGA work programme needs to conclude “with a substantive framework, including ambitious targets that delivers on the need for increasing adaptation action and support.” In addition, it called for “the GGA and its framework outcome” to “include the establishment of the GGA stand-alone agenda item, development of indicators to track progress, and assessment reports.”

The G77 also highlighted that “the 2023 Adaptation Gap Report places the financing gap for adaptation between USD 194 and 366 billion per year. Even if we double the current finance allocated to adaptation by 2025, this gap would only be reduced by 5-10%. A drastic increase of adaptation finance is needed from developed countries for developing countries now,” said the statement further.

Just Transition Pathways

The G77 also said that “the overarching context in which climate action needs to take place is delivering on sustainable development and poverty eradication”. On the establishment of a new work programme on Just Transition Pathways. The Group looked forward to “this work programme supporting a whole-of-society and all-of-economy transition, to achieve more equitable

and sustainable societies, within a more just world”, adding that “it must also, have a holistic approach that transcends mere mitigation or sector-specific focuses, embracing all three dimensions of sustainable development. This vision of addressing not only the environmental, but also the economic and social realities of climate change and ensuring climate justice, is premised on each Party having the sovereign right to choose its own developmental pathway towards shared objectives”.

“The Work Programme must not confine to the energy sector or specific regions; it is a universal commitment to a just transition that includes everyone: workers, impacted communities, and businesses, especially small medium enterprises that face unique challenges during this transition. In this sense, the Group underscores that the just transitions must be equitable, inclusive, and sustainable for all,” said the G77.

Means of Implementation

The G77 said that “The continued failure of developed countries to meet their commitment to jointly mobilize US\$ 100 billion per year by 2020 and through 2025 is a serious concern” and “is one of the main reasons of the lack of trust in the process. Guaranteeing tangible progress and transparency in the finance agenda is, therefore, key to the success of COP 28. We would also like to see us move forward on the procedural and substantive discussions on the new collective quantified goal (NCQG)” on finance.

The Group expressed grave concern “about the attempts to deviate the discussion on the fulfillment of existing obligations of developed countries through twisted interpretations of Article 2.1(c) of the Paris Agreement that are adversely impacting developing countries as we stand here today, and any interpretation of the article should be complementary to Article 9.”

Technology Transfer

Regarding technology transfer and cooperation, the Group underscored “the need for trillions of dollars in funding per year to meet the needs of developing countries. Neither adaptation nor

capacity building are contemplated in this figure. The Technology Mechanism is the UNFCCC instrument for facilitating technology development and transfer towards climate resilience and low GHG emission development, but is constrained by the lack of funding. We urge developed countries to increase funding for this mechanism, particularly for the Climate Technology Centre and Network (CTCN) and emphasize the need for enhanced support for national designated entities and to build upon local institutions and networks”.

Other sub-groups of the G77/China also echoed the remarks of Cuba.

Brazil speaking for the **BASIC (Brazil, China, India and South Africa)** called on all Parties “to reinforce their strong commitment to the UNFCCC, its Kyoto Protocol and its Paris Agreement, guided by its principles and provisions, stressing that now, more than ever, is the time to strengthen multilateralism and reject unilateralism”.

It said the GST “is the space we consider where we were, where we are, how did we get here, and where we want to be”, adding that “developed countries must honor their historical responsibilities or recognize they have failed, or have no willingness to fulfil their legal obligations of taking the lead in climate change. Such honesty is essential for responsibly aligning narrative and action, as we cannot negotiate with the atmosphere”.

Brazil said that the outcome of the GST “must unleash unprecedented international cooperation and effectively recognize outstanding implementation gaps, and provide assurance that developed countries’ obligations to take the lead in mitigation and to provide the means of implementation and support will be met”.

“Strongly committed to multilateralism”, BASIC “looked forward to a GST that addresses concerns with unilateral and coercive climate change related measures that constitute a disguised restriction on international trade”. It opposed “all forms of unilateralism and protectionism, adding that such measures seriously undermine multilateral cooperation and the ability of the concerned countries to combat climate change”. It stressed

that Parties “should also collectively question any measures to restrict trade and investment and setting up new green trade barriers, such as unilateral carbon border taxes, with the pretext of addressing climate change, which are incompatible with multilateral rules and principles both under the UNFCCC and the World Trade Organization”.

BASIC also noted with concern, that “there has been a significant increase in the production and consumption of fossil fuels by developed countries in recent years and encouraged developed countries to take the lead in phasing-out their own fossil fuel production and consumption, in an accelerated manner”.

Bolivia for the **Like-minded developing countries** expressed “its deepest solidarity with the people of Palestine and strongly condemned the loss of civilian lives in the conflict”.

It also underscored that “the process must be Party-driven, inclusive and transparent, with no parachuting of texts, and for text to emerge from Parties’ views followed by line-by-line negotiations on all the issues, including the GST.”

On the GST, the LMDC stressed “the differentiation of commitments, historical responsibility and legal obligations of developed countries for their leadership in mitigation and provision of finance, technological transfer and capacity building to developing countries, including for the latter to reach net-zero and net-negative as soon as possible and to allow equitable access to the global carbon budget. It also called for the outcome to reflect explicitly the failures of pre-2020 developed countries’ obligations and their impacts on our collective progress and the carbon budget.”

The LMDC also expressed concern that “the second replenishment of the GCF resulted in lower levels of pledges compared to the first

replenishment and that furthermore, no solid evidence indicates that the USD 100 billion (per year) has been achieved. It also added that the lack of transparency and accountability due to the lack of an agreed definition of climate finance does not allow us to measure what our partners claim to be climate finance and hoped the operational definition of climate finance is updated”.

It also recalled that the decision in COP26 was to at least double adaptation finance, adding that “we must not confine ourselves to a lower bound and recognize that the amount is really minuscule considering the annual adaptation finance requirements of our countries.”

Zambia, for the **African Group** in its statement said that “the Adaptation Gap Report, the Emissions Gap Report, and the report on delivery of the USD 100 billion are all clear, we are off-track in meeting the goals of the Convention and the Paris Agreement.” It noted with concern that “the global greenhouse gas emissions increased by 1.2% from 2021 to 2022, to reach a new record high, resulting in accelerated climate risks and impacts worldwide, and hence exacerbating poverty in developing countries.” It also noted that “the adaptation finance gap is widening, reaching an estimated USD366 billion per year,” and expressed regret that the Adaptation Gap Report states that climate finance to developing countries had decreased by 15% in 2021.”

Saudi Arabia for **Arab Group** also echoed the statement of the G77/China and in addition, expressed condemnation of the Israeli aggression of Gaza and the war crimes committed there, stressing the need to stop the war immediately.

Other groupings of developing countries also delivered their statements, including developed countries.