

Divergences over Means of Implementation for Adaptation

Baku, 15 Nov (Eqram Mustaqeem)- At the climate talks in Baku, Azerbaijan, discussions on adaptation related matters under the UNFCCC's Subsidiary Bodies continued to see divergences between developed and developing countries on the issue of the provision of the means of implementation (MOI).

Informal consultations on adaptation began on 12 Nov. with Parties addressing matters related to the Global Goal on Adaptation (GGA), National Adaptation Plans (NAP) and the Adaptation Committee (AC).

On the GGA related agenda, divergences between developed and developing countries emerged over whether there should be indicators on MOI for the implementation of the GGA targets, as well on the consideration of the notion of 'transformational adaptation'.

On the NAPs agenda, Parties deliberated on the progress made in the process to formulate and implement NAPs. In the AC consultations, Parties for the first time deliberated on two separate tracks - the 'Report of the AC' and the 'Review of the progress, effectiveness and performance of the AC' as both were previously merged as one track.

Global Goal on Adaptation (GGA)

In Dubai, by [decision 2/CMA.5](#), Parties adopted the historical decision on the GGA framework known as the 'UAE Framework for Global Climate Resilience' (UAE Framework), which includes seven thematic targets and four dimensional targets of the iterative adaptation cycle referred to in decision 3/CMA.4.

[The thematic targets cover (i) water, (ii) food and agriculture, (iii) health, (iv) ecosystems and biodiversity, (v) infrastructure and human settlements, (vi) poverty eradication and livelihoods and (viii) protection of cultural heritage, while the dimensional targets are (i) impact, vulnerability and risk assessment, (ii) planning, (iii) implementation and (iv) monitoring.]

The Dubai decision also established a two-year UAE-Belem work programme (UBWP) on indicators for measuring progress achieved towards the thematic and dimensional targets, with a view to identifying and, as needed, developing indicators and potential qualified elements for those targets. Parties have stressed that a decision in Baku is critical, as it is the

midpoint of the UBWP work which will need to be concluded by COP30 in Belém next year.

Co-facilitators of the informal consultations taking place under the UNFCCC Subsidiary Bodies are **Tina Kobilšek (Slovenia)** and **Lamin Dibba (the Gambia)**. In the first session of informal consultations, which began on 12 Nov, the co-facilitators indicated that only the UBWP and paragraph 38 of the decision will be discussed.

[Para 38 reads as follows: “Requests the Subsidiary Body for Implementation and the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice to initiate the consideration of matters relating to the global goal on adaptation at their sixtieth sessions (June 2024),...with a view to providing recommendations for consideration and adoption by the CMA...at its seventh session (November 2025), focusing on, inter alia:

- (a) The exchange of knowledge, experience and information related to implementing the UAE Framework for Global Climate Resilience, including in relation to efforts to achieve the targets..., with the aim of fostering implementation;
- (b) The identification of potential inputs to future global stocktakes related to achieving the global goal on adaptation, including by considering how the UAE Framework for Global Climate Resilience can facilitate the analysis of information required for assessing progress towards the goal;
- (c) The enhancement of understanding of, inter alia, the risks and impacts associated with different temperature increases across different regions;
- (d) The opportunities for building on the best available science, including collaboration with the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change and other organizations, to provide information relevant to facilitating implementation of the UAE Framework for Global Climate Resilience, including in relation to the targets ...; to developing indicators, metrics and methodologies; and to identifying adaptation capacity gaps, challenges and the needs of developing countries;
- (e) The development of terms of reference for reviewing the UAE Framework for Global Climate Resilience, including the time frame for review.]

Prior to the co-facilitators outlining what will be discussed at the first informal consultation,

process points were raised by several Parties including **Saudi Arabia** for the **Arab Group**, **China** for the **Like-Minded Developing Countries [LMDC]**, and **Morocco** for the **African Group** who were against any discussion on ‘transformational adaptation’ on the premise that the [report on transformational adaptation](#) prepared by the secretariat was given very late, and there was no time to properly go through it. On the contrary, the **Netherlands** for the **European Union (EU)**, **Japan** and **Canada** were for its discussion. Divergence on this matter continued in the second round of informal consultations.

Continuing on the substance of Parties’ intervention on the UBWP at the first informal consultation, there was consensus by Parties that the current number of indicators that have been mapped and developed by experts stood at 5,304 as per the [report](#) prepared by the secretariat on the indicators and was unworkable, and there is need to further refine the indicators to a much more manageable figure.

Intervention by Parties also largely agreed on the need to provide further guidance and criteria to the experts to allow them to further continue their work on indicators. A large number of Parties also agreed that there should be two levels of indicators, namely global level indicators that track progress towards the GGA, and optional indicators that Parties can choose to best fit their own national circumstances. However, divergences, mainly between developed and developing countries were clear when it came to the development of indicators for the means of Implementation (MOI).

Sri Lanka for the **G77 and China** emphasised two key areas of focus for discussion - guidance for the experts of the work programme taking into account the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities (CBDR-RC), and the guidelines for the experts’ way of work. It also recommended that the expert group compile indicators on MOI and wanted a stand-alone agenda item on the GGA that goes beyond CMA7 (2025).

Panama for the **Independent Alliance of Latin America and Caribbean (AILAC)** stated that there must be a balance of geographical contribution on

indicators, and that there must be one headline target for each thematic target and optional targets for each theme, while recognising the need for MOI indicators.

Uruguay for Group Sur suggested to have five indicators per target, with a total of fifty- five indicators for all the targets, balancing between quantitative and qualitative indicators. The group emphasised that MOI is essential in advancing the GGA.

The **African Group** emphasised that there was an absence of African experts on several indicator development groups and also stressed that there should be MOI indicators.

The **Arab Group** stressed that the current list of indicators does not include indicators on MOI from developed to developing countries in line with their commitments and that all indicators be aligned with Article 7.1 of the Paris Agreement [PA] [on the GGA].

The **LMDC** said that MOI from developed to developing countries towards achieving the GGA targets should be a core consideration in the development of indicators, with action and support being reflected in a balanced manner through the work of the expert groups on indicators.

However, developed countries such as **Japan, Australia, New Zealand, the EU and Canada** vehemently opposed any inclusion of MOI indicators, on the basis that it is not part of the scope of the UBWP. On the other hand the **United Kingdom (UK)** expressed its openness to discuss and hear from experts on the importance of indicators on MOI.

At the second session of informal consultations, the co-facilitators wanted discussions on para 38 of the Dubai decision. However, developed countries such as **Japan, Switzerland, Australia, Canada, United States (US), the UK** took the opportunity to emphasise their desire to discuss the notion of 'transformational adaptation'. The **Arab Group, African Group, LMDC** and the **LDCs** continued to maintain that this should not be discussed here but next year, due to the late receipt of the report on transformational adaptation.

Parties made very technical submissions on how they envision the elements in para 38 to be operationalised.

The **Arab Group** said that "Advancing the GGA should not just be about setting targets and ambition but it is also about delivering and implementing meaningful action. All of our adaptation actions and support must be guided by provisions of UNFCCC and the PA including equity and CBDR, this must be reflected in the draft. Developed countries must meet their commitment and obligation to provide MOI as per Article 9.1 of the PA. We hear the call from our partners on transformational adaptation; yet they (have) barely delivered nor provided anything on their finance obligations. They have historical emissions but yet it is developing countries that have to transform all of their systems without any resources provided to meet their priorities and needs."

The Arab group's submission on para 38 revolved around the creation of a "Baku Adaptation Roadmap", with the intention of advancing implementation of the GGA, and this proposal was opposed by developed countries.

The **LMDC** echoing on similar sentiments with the Arab Group emphasised that any discussion on para 38 should recognise para 32 of the UAE framework which recognises that: "...the extent to which the UAE Framework for Global Climate Resilience is implemented by developing country Parties depends on, inter alia, engagement and action at all levels, and the effective implementation by developed country Parties of means of implementation and support commitments." It emphasised that any work on the GGA should be interpreted through the lens of para 32, and that this would ensure that the cardinal principles of equity and CBDR would be properly taken into consideration in any GGA related matters.

Following the discussions, the co-facilitators indicated that there was general consensus in the room for them to produce a draft text for the consideration of Parties, which was received on 14 Nov and deliberations are expected to continue on 15 Nov. onwards.

National Adaptation Plans (NAP)

The NAP negotiations at Bonn in June this year, culminated in the production of an [informal note](#) that is now a matter of contention between developed and developing countries. The informal consultations co-facilitated by **Meredith Ryder-Rude (US)** and **Antwi-Boasiako Amoah (Ghana)**, saw direct contrasting positions between developed and developing countries.

While the **G77 and China** wanted to use the informal note from the June session, developed countries wanted to mandate the co-facilitators at this session to draft a new text that is only informed by the informal note, not taking the whole of it and to further incorporate interventions made by Parties in ongoing informal consultations into the new draft text.

A compromise solution was reached between the two blocs to mandate the co-facilitators to colour code any duplication from the informal note with explanatory comments. When Parties had received the colour coded informal note, the **G77 and China** at the informal consultations on 13 Nov. expressed that the colour coded informal was not agreeable with the bloc which resulted in an impasse in the consultations.

At the informal consultations on 14 Nov., the Subsidiary Body on Implementation (SBI) Chair,

Nabeel Munir (Pakistan), pleaded with Parties to find a way to come to consensus in the NAP negotiations, “as there is no time left to spare with the first week nearing a close.”

In the spirit of compromise, **Fiji** for the **G77 and China**, mandated the co-facilitators to streamline the text, with specific guidance. Such guidance included explicit references to developed countries obligations and the need to scale up finance; MOI for formulation and implementation of NAP with clear references to financial resources, capacity building and technology transfer; acknowledgement of the huge gap in financial resources for adaptation and the urgency to fill this gap for the implementation of NAPs in developing countries and any references to the private sector as a provider of financial resources for NAP is unacceptable with MOI from developed countries having to be reflected in each section of the draft text.

The developed countries emphasised their preference of language on the private sector in the streamlined text.

The co-facilitators stated that they will release the draft text by 15 Nov. at a time that would allow for an adequate time for Parties to go through before the next informal consultations the same day.