SBI/SBSTA: Report of the Adaptation Committee

Prepared by: Tamsen Reed

Date: December 4, 2019

Session/Agenda Item: SBI 51, Agenda Item #10; SBSTA 51, Agenda Item #3: Informal consultations on the report of the Adaptation Committee

Location: UNFCCC COP 25, Madrid

Room Number: Room 14, Hall 9

Attachments: - https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/sb2019_03E.pdf

Notes/Summary:

- **Background:** COP 17 requested the AC to report annually to the COP through the subsidiary bodies.48 Two regular meetings of the AC took place in Bonn in 2019: the 15th meeting from 19 to 21 March and the 16th meeting from 9 to 12 September. The 2019 report of the AC reflects the outcomes of those meetings and of intersessional work of the AC. 42. Action: The SBI and the SBSTA will be invited to consider the 2019 report of the AC and to recommend draft conclusions and/or a draft decision resulting from the implementation of the workplan of the AC in 2019 for consideration and adoption at COP 25.
- **CoF1:** As you may recall, the COP will take appropriate actions based on the recommendations of the SBI. Later during the CMA agenda adoption, the President announced the CMA would take appropriate action based on this Agenda Item. Thus, we are directed to develop recommendations for COP and CMA. (Attempts to get draft text up on the screen. CoF directs parties to online source for the draft text after unable to get text on screens, but I'm unsure where to find it). I suggest we now turn to the substance, and eventually agree that the form follows the substance. Mostly parties have welcomed the report and noted the report's findings were a good start. Some parties felt the AC report's findings were not balanced. Some agreed to the AC timeline, while others requested review of the timeline.
- **EU:** We are in agreement with the conclusion for formal recommendations, and with these joint SBI/SBSTA agenda items producing one outcome. What we are tasked with is receiving the AC report and generating appropriate recommendation to the COP and CMA on how to act on those recommendations. We have looked at the recommendations, and feel that they all will apply to both the COP and the CMA equally, therefore we agree with the notion of having two recommendations developed for the COP and CMA, and that they be identical, so that both the COP and CMA can act on the AC report.

- **Kuwait:** on the draft text that you mentioned, I think that they are combined together, so we can make different annexes, so that it won't be merged together. Saying that, from yesterday, most of the intervention that I heard was about the funding from the private sector and the public sector. We don't need to neglect the funding from developed countries. Second, for the recommendation for the gender on page 3c(?), while we have other vulnerable groups in 85(d), that we have to focus more on these vulnerable groups other than gender, rather than naming or expressing them as vulnerable.
- **Norway**: Can you please repeat what paragraph was our colleague from Egypt referring too, please?
- **Kuwait**: I am actually from Kuwait. I was referring to 83(c) from the AC report, recommendation 85(c), 85(d).
- **Trinidad + Tobago**: on behalf of small island states. We want to reiterate and underscore, there's a lot of emphasis on leveraging financing from private sector, but we don't want to lose sight of finance from developed countries and support. We don't want to negotiate that here, but we want to note that's a need for us from developed states. Private sector investment is valued, but small for us, in many senses of that word.
- **Australia**: We've been listening to what we're hearing around the room and looking for areas of compromise. We think the recommendations are good, and the committee has done good work and are well put together. On 83(c), raised by Kuwait, Australia supports gender being there. If it's a sticking point, we'd be happy to bring over the language from 85(d) to include other groups as well. Regarding private sector mobilization, we need people to understand that this is not the only source of finance, but we want to keep it in the text, because it was what AC was specifically asked fir. But, we'd be happy to include language that emphasized that private sector funding was one of many sources, if that would progress adoption of the recommendations
- **Uruguay**: As indicated yesterday, we want to see recommendations in line with structural finance from developed countries, and to define the role of private finance, such that we believe private sector investment is important, but it is new, and facts on the ground prove high need for public finance of adaptation. We are not negotiating finance here, but we need this language in line with the PA. On gender, we think this brings balance to the conversation. Regarding your proposal, perhaps you can give a little more information on possible legal implications of this being the first time we've addressed this item – regarding best approach to these proposals. We recognize specific mandates from the CMA from last year, that might have different legal implications. But in our view, we should be clear in our current mandates and responsibilities from the chair and the secratariat.
- **Botswana**: on behalf of Africa group. On two things raised so far, on the issue of the outcome for discussion, we are of the view that the outcome would need to be separate whether it's in one document, since we have a mandate from both the COP and the CMA. So, one document perhaps with two sections for each mandate. On the issue of the

recommendations, we shared our views as Africa group that the AC recommendations are not balanced compared to the full work of the AC. For example, the capacity gap in accessing funding, which is not accurately reflected in the recommendations. Second, on the issue of the private sector, we agree with views that it requires the maturity of the private sector to be useful, but cannot support it right now without including public sector inclusion.

- **CoF**: Requests written comments from parties to inform the draft text for decisions. We have about 15 minutes left today, and I would encourage you to send me your further conclusions so they can be included in our reflections
- **Angola**: speaking on behalf of LDCs: I would like to make substantive comment on (???). Our top priority is support for public funding for adaptation. It's important highly to LDCs that for now find that engaging the public sector would be very difficult. The work of the AC is good work, but needs more experience to share with everyone. We are not comfortable with language focusing mostly on the private sector
- **Ecuador**: (Hard to understand) We would like to keep our understanding of what would be the implications of doing so, if we have some clarity about that. However, we don't see the recommendation about the private sector as a way forward. We don't see that kind of investment in our countries, so we want more balance in what is possible for finance structure recommendations from the report.
- **Uruguay**: We are fine with you to continue to draft the text with a view that the text should be balanced in regards to the finance. Also, if we're understanding, address (???) public finance, which we find most primary and relevant of the conversation right now, and that should be reflected. We want to show the findings of the report, but reflecting these concerns. A third possibility for the two mandates questions, is that we write a unique text on the substance, plus an additional paragraph specific to the CMA and one to the COP. This is not a proposal, just a possible format for consideration as you draft your text tonight.
- **USA**: Thank you CoF, I believe Colombia was first…. Coming back to the concerns about the private sector, I'm not understanding what the issue is here. These paragraphs seem to reflect an ongoing position of the AC, and not a new direction. In addition, we keep hearing that there's a need for more public support, at all these negotiations and agenda items on funding, there's an expressed need to increase funding and funding sources. These conversations now today only want to have one flavor of funding discussed, and that just doesn't make sense. This isn't mandating anything, just invitations to do pretty innocuous activities to increase private sector participation in your adaptation.
- **Colombia**: In regard to the recommendations (hard to understand), some of the recommendations on the private sector are useful, and could be part of the decision. I think the important think is to keep the integrity of the decisions recommended to the CMA and the COP.

- **CoF:** one text with two parts, one with content for CMA and one COP. The one document we are referring to is one text that has two parts so we don’t have two clear parts. Once agreed, the document will be separated to two parts and sent to the two different bodies. It is one working document that will be separated into two when final. Now we need to determine what goes to COP and what goes to CMA decisions
- **Ecuador:** clarification: what would be different between the content for these two bodies’ documents?
- **Uruguay:** I would suggest you release only one document tonight that doesn’t prejudge the final format of the document
- **CoF:** Thank you Uruguay. What we’ll try to do is put together a text reflecting the conversations we’ve had in the past two days, and the substance going around the room, and go through those two elements, and see what needs to go to the CMA and what goes to the COP.

Follow-up:

- Next meeting will be on December 5th, 4:00pm, Room 14

Take Away:

- The SBI/SBSTA needs to produce a draft decision with recommendations to the CMA and COP, based on the most recent Adaptation Committee Report. At present, the parties are having trouble deciding how to format this document to serve both bodies. The co-facilitator plans to use one working draft document that will be split into two, and sent separately to each body in conclusion of their mandate.
- Developing nations, with statements from the G-77, the Africa group, AOSIS, Small Island States and the LDC group, want text included in the draft that emphasizes their need for increased access to public finance along with private sector investment.