

Date and time	Thursday 6 June, 3:10-5 pm
Agenda item	SBI 10(a)/SBSTA 5(a): Matters relating to the global goal on adaptation
Session	2 nd informal consultation
Location	Nairobi
Notes taken by:	Matti Goldberg, Woodwell Climate Research Center

FACILITATOR:

- (Explains the structure); challenging to capture everything in a first draft;
- Four areas: mapping, expert involvement, workshops/dialogue, criteria;
- Keep interventions short, and if there are points you don't see reflected, please raise them here; time to work on bridging proposals; area of convergence: urgency to agree on a way forward at this session;
- For para 38 we have a placeholder, but as these were not shared in the room, we did not include them in the first iteration; but we'll give enough space for discussion on this as well;

G77 and CHINA:

- We are ready to engage with the text;
- We'd like to see means of implementation, on which not much is included, and the need for having the modalities concluded at SB 60; the focus should also be on para 38;
- Let's add a disclaimer, which states: "the CFs have prepared this draft text on the understanding that the elements in para 38 will be discussed under this agenda, and [the roadmap for the WP does not preclude the consideration of other elements under this WP]; recall para 38;
- For A: exchange of KL etc.: a placeholder for (a) to (d), and to have placeholders after each; and add (f): "other matters";

FACILITATOR:

- So we add each of the subitems of para 38, and then add (f);
- And you mentioned means of implementation: there is A(a) and B(b), but that is for Parties to develop and to negotiate;

EIG:

- Mexico: mapping options: option B is preferable because it promotes the engagement of UN agencies and regional stakeholders; expert groups should take part in the expert process; but we'd like coordination with the AC and the NWP; we support option A(1): balanced regional rep is optimal; particular attention to SIDS; iterative adaptation cycle, attention to needs and specific requirements of each region; the sec should facilitate the technical work in the six official languages of the UN; involve national statistical institutions, and RCCs should coordinate these efforts (they can work in regional languages); important to include coordinated work with relevant CBs inside and outside the UNFCCC; paras 5 and 6 are important because they reflect inclusivity; add youth and women;
- Workshops: we support Opt 2, granted that all targets are covered; support is needed to facilitate participation by Parties; need workshop before CMA 6;
- We support having global indicators with a menu of optional national level indicators;

SAMOA (AOSIS):

- Align with G77; text is a collection of reflections made and now we should streamline the text, finding commonalities etc.;
- Top priority is to decide on the modalities of the WP so that indicator development can start immediately;

- The AC should help the sec with the mapping of existing indicators based on a round of submissions by stakeholders; but AC should not convene expert groups because they already have a workplan and deliverables;
- we are 6 months to the WP; so work has to start now, not wait for AC to consider how this work should look like;
- A group made of negotiators would politicize things; need to clarify which experts to include and who should hold the pen; need regional representation and full transparency;
- Text:
 - Mapping: Option A: many things are OK; aim: get as much input as possible, and WS in September for Parties to consider things; need as many actors as possible involved; so have an open round of submissions to be synthesized by the AC; important to include diverse views
 - Add a section on data readiness; this should be analyzed after the mapping; but just because data doesn't exist doesn't mean we shouldn't have an indicator;
 - Expert engagement: work off of option 1: regional representation, consideration for SIDS, ensure regional balanced consideration of SIDS and LDCs as stand-alone regions; the groups should meet virtually, intersessionally, and in-person three times; we're fine with inclusion of IPs; options 2, 7 and 8 aims at similar direction, but para 4 articulates timelines better;
 - We don't believe any indicators are obligatory: need clarity on [...]
 - Keep (h), (j) and (p), keep t, u, v and d
 - The criteria is not necessarily criteria for indicators; add (q) in other considerations;
 - Outcome: last WS between SB 62 and CMA7 should finalize the indicators based on the work of expert working groups;
 - Global vs supplementary: [...]

COLOMBIA (AILAC):

- Align with G77
- Useful to exchange how to streamline; some commonalities;
- Our position: have agreement on the modalities at this session;
- The GGA is not only para 39, but also consider para. 38 considerations; have a discussion on this at least;
- AILAC agrees with the structure;
- Mapping: options reflected here keep the elements that we look for; option B encompasses the main areas we see; concern: we are not talking about obligatory global indicators; we need to have means of implementation in place and predictable financial resources for the implementation of the GGA FW; option B but no obligatory global indicators;
- Need to map data readiness; we highlighted that in the submission; this paragraph should come after the mapping process;
- We can work on option B on the mapping, but perhaps we can [...]
- Option C: we cannot support the NWP to do any kind of job because there is a huge gaps of financial resources; the NWP cannot deliver a report, for example; it has no means to support us in this process;
- Option 1 and 2 can be merged; they are complementary; but also need an additional paragraph clearly capturing the intersessional work that's needed; need to get in sufficient time in advance, consider expert groups;
- AC role: there's too much workload in terms of what they've been doing; we do not see the AC leading the process of developing the indicators

- We support para 5 (SBSTA and SBI to ensure that regions are represented); LatAm and Caribbean are often not represented in the work, as often are not experts from other developing countries;
- Support para. 6: importance of indigenous peoples
- Workshop and dialogues: we can work with option 2, but we want to highlight that we do not see the workshops only in conjunction with the SB meetings; SBs have huge agendas, and it's difficult to ensure we can engage properly during the sessions;
- Option 9 and 10: delete both of them; we share views of AOSIS: much of the criteria is not criteria; these could be in another section; AOSIS idea to have "other considerations" is useful;
- IPs role if key, but not a criteria per se;
- Outcome: like AOSIS, we support Option 2, but we need a final workshop that allows us to see the final package in order to see the whole picture before the SB Chairs forward the outcome intersessionally;

BOTSWANA (AGN):

- This text shows some of the views we've presented, but we want to reflect them further;
- Mandate is from para. 38, and for the modalities in para 39; we need conclusions on both mandates; we support G77 proposal to ensure that para 38 is included in this text;
- Include conclusions on item (f), which is "other matters";
- The GST outcome identified the increasing financing gap, and the GGA must consider this; this needs to be clearly articulated in relation to both paras. 38 and 39;
- Modalities:
 - We find commonalities in some options, but also some gaps:
 - Some options duplicate things and we can merge (e.g. para 3 and 4);
- Who will do this work:
 - We want to keep this work simple; modalities should not delay the work;
 - The SBI and SBSTA should set up AH Expert Group; composition: nominees from UN regional groups; 20 members; will elect two co-chairs; will end at SB 62; developing country experts should be fully supported in their participation;
- How will they do the work:
 - Nominations should be done by groups of Parties by end of June 2024; two meetings in 2024 and 2025, and additional meetings as necessary;
 - Two workshops with Parties and non-Parties; Sept 2024, and March 2025; \
- What will be done:
 - July 2024: submissions from Parties on the indicators
 - Sept 2024: workshop 1 to consider mapping, and identify gaps and how to fill them;
 - Nov 2024: consider progress made, and provide further guidance to expert group;
 - March 2025:
 - April 2025: report on work on indicators for Party considerations
 - June 2025: consider report;
 - Nov 2025: conclude work.
- Lot of views on expert groups, and we see them reflected; we'd like to see them so established;

BRAZIL (Grupo Sur):

- Align with G77; thank you for the text to work with;
- UAE-Belem does not prevent us from discussing elements of para. 38; we support a placeholder for all the lines in para 38; but this session is about the modalities, as they are essential for driving action on the targets; we merged some of the options, but the language needs to be enhanced;

- Mapping: sec, in collab with CBs and experts should do this; we align with AILAC - we need Mol and support for indicators; we cannot mandate the NWP due to lack of resources and imbalance when it comes to regional representation; SBs should invite Parties and observers to provide inputs based on experiences;
- Four groups of experts: infrast and cultural, X, Y, and APC targets;
- [...]
- Parties should suggest names of experts through the submission portal by the end of July; the AC has a role to assist the sec in the mapping, but not leading the work;
- WS: SB Chairs to organize a WS prior to SB 61, provide feedback, and further areas of indicators;

SUDAN (LDCs):

- We need to finalize these modalities in Bonn;
- Streamline the text as much as possible; narrow down options; [...] please reflect this point clearly;
- On mapping: options 2, 3 and 4 under Option A are useful sources of input - pls merge those; include deadline of July for inputs from Parties, and X 2024 as a deadline for the mapping; we support option A, and streamlined option of 1, 2 and 3 is a good way forward;
- Resources for developing country experts should be made available; SBs and specialized agencies could host the expert group; we cannot support the AC leading the work, for the reasons outlined by AOSIS and AILAC; the options do not give any assurance of expert participation and the availability of resources for them to work;
- Workshops: open to these; they can lead the technical work within the political process; but this can only happen if we are discussing and finalizing expert groups;
- Criteria: support AOSIS and AILAC; the list is long and some do contradict each other;
- Modalities doesn't mean we won't unpack para. 38 at future sessions; elements of 38 will be discussed at future sessions;

EU:

- Mapping: prefer C.2 - reassurance: start the work right away and be technically robust; inclusivity is key for us; discuss how the AC can facilitate this; how does the proposed expert group differ from the AC? Mirror options A, 1 and 3, and option C, 1 and 3;
- Reiterate voluntary nature of the framework;
- Experts: consider workshops together with this; Option A is not our option; for streamlining these options could be merged; D and E are rather vague and cannot ensure an ambitious process;
- Learn from GLASS: have reflections by Parties and NPSs; option 3 is preferred, but could also support option 9;
- Criteria: important and should guide the mapping exercise; chapeau speaks to the selection of indicators is premature; first we need mapping, technical work, etc., and then conclude with the relevant indicators; technically sound sources are critical in complementing the indicator work; lot of elements that we'd like to see; some are even in para 8 of 2/CMA.5. A functional list of criteria must be more focused; we believe options r, aa and bb do not reflect.
- X should be deleted or complemented with a "no text" option;
- SBI and SBSTA requested the AC, LEG and NWP to provide presentations on relevant work at SB 62;
- We need to add language on financial costs;

USA:

- This is a compilation of views, and we need to move forward; we hope that the next iteration would be a more manageable text that reduces redundancies;

- Mapping: main issue is covering who is the main entity, and who the main entity collaborates with; options should reflect answers to those;
- Expert engagement: what kind of input? Refine, identify gaps, etc.?
- Workshop modality: this needs substantive discussion once there's clarity on other parts; this depends on what we want from the mapping;
- Criteria: need to differentiate between criteria that's included in the mapping, and criteria for how we think about the outcome in Belem; e.g. "no additional burden" is not relevant for the mapping;
- Para 3: support C, suboption 1; AC: has a flexible rolling workplan to respond to priorities of Parties. This work is critical, so it can start work immediately after conclusion of SB 60; the AC would probably be the fastest way to start the work; this is a body dedicated to technical adaptation work. If we don't trust that, then we need to talk.
- Para 5 if an option with 4, rather than its own para;
- Para 7, support option 10;
- Para 8, agree with EU on the chapeau; here we see criteria relevant to the mapping as a, b, f, n, t, u and z = specific to mapping
- Para 10: our option is not there; delete or add a "no text" option;
- Para 38: flexible to engage on this and include a placeholder, or discuss the EU's alternative proposal;
- Adding subpara (f): we have a specific mandate, and we do not support adding a new element.

CHINA (LMDC):

- The text is good progress;
- We should be in line with previous mandate: we support the structure of the text to comprehensively from para. 38 to give clear pictures of what kind of content we still need to discuss; no aspects should be left behind; there's an inter alia in para 38, so there's a window to ensure nothing is left behind;
- Mapping: we don't want to invite AC to lead the work; the AC has clear boundaries, especially regarding Mol; we don't want duplication or gaps; the AC has big challenges to reflect all the Parties' views, especially how to link actions with support for different thematic areas;
- Experts: option 2 is a good approach, but there's a reference to identification of gaps; it should mean of implementation here as well; add some timeline for this work
- Workshop: option 4 might be considered;
- We want each report of workshops should be produced one week after the workshop has been held;
- Criteria:
 - we want global + voluntary indicators, so some of the criteria belong to different layers because they are subject to different criteria; (aa): this is important for considering the criteria (para 34 of 2/CMA.5). Criteria: consider how to articulate the indicators reflecting action and support;
 - Consider different temperature scenarios; be global in nature and applicable across different contexts; avoid additional reporting burdens - this is different: use the original language to highlight these criteria; capture: in accordance with national circumstances;
 - Indigenous KL: lost key words: "local communities and indigenous peoples"
- Adaptation action: always add "and support" after that;
- Criteria: be based on robust methodology - we don't know what methodologies belong to robust, because countries have different contributions to the GGA work; this is ambiguous;
- [...]
- Some conflict with national circumstances;

CANADA:

- Support a lead role for the AC - this is what the AC was created to do;
- Start work promptly; AC can start at the end of this month; expert groups will take much longer;
- Workshops: any options need to be better developed to understand the outputs;
- Criteria: this would be better included under the mapping
- Sec to provide information on financial implications ASAP during this session;
- Para. 38 - better to take this up at future sessions;
- (f): can't support this because we don't know what would be discussed under this;
- We support the reference to IPs in this text and all text

AUS:

- We have preference to the AC to shepherd the mapping process; organize information and contributions from experts; it's a coordination role and AC is appropriate for that, and if it's not, we need to ask why we have an AC;
- Mapping by COP 29 is vital so that we can set up for success for next year;
- We prioritize the modalities; this should be a no. 1 priority; we often run out of time in the negotiations because we stack more and more things on the drafts and lose priorities; this might be happening now;
- Criteria: shorter, cleaner, more general;
- I note a desire to put in MoI here; that risks derailing this train even before it leaves the station; Dubai is not renegotiable; adaptation finance sits outside this room and always has;
- Options match those communicated by the US and the EU;

UK:

- The FW is broader than the WP, and para 38 is important; but we don't support (f);
- We'd like to see the options merged and streamlined;
- Mapping & engaging experts: can be streamlined;
- Dialogues and workshops: consider how these with the broader modalities;
- Criteria: some points are relevant, but not criteria;
- Remove the final section on the outcome;

JAPAN:

- We hope the CFs can streamline for the next iteration;
- Modalities: clarify what we'd like to achieve; clarify the rationale for workshops, and for the sec to disclose costs, and whether there's enough budget; without this, we cannot support workshops;
- Criteria: it's for the mapping, and currently has too many elements;
- MoI indicators: FW belongs to all, so we don't support MoI indicators;
- Mapping: Option C.2 - AC to lead; support lead role for AC;
- Expert engagement: subject to cost implications
- Workshops: prefer option 10
- Outcome: a list of indicators that are voluntary and customizable;
- Para 38: as EU, US: not acceptable to add subpara (f)

RUSSIA:

- Confusing: the criteria part - maybe this is a language question; need to understand who will use the indicators; we understand that the criteria should be the basis for indicator selection; arguably the indicators are universal;
- Participation of AC and all UNFCCC CBs is preferable;
- Clarity: does AC have an opportunity to engage after this decision is taken;
- Understand schedule of the workshops with expected outcomes;

- We'd like to see a set of core indicators for GGA targets, plus voluntary indicators; we prefer two sets of indicators;
- We do not support obligatory language, but clarification was fine;
- Para. 38: we support this reference;

SAUDI ARABIA (Arab Group):

- Thank you for this great work; align with G77;
- Support adding (f)
- Para 38 and 40 is for the SB Chairs, and that's where we see the mandate coming from;
- UN agencies and other research centers from different backgrounds should contribute; contributions of NWP etc.: this is a mitigation work programme
- The priorities of all developing countries must be considered and treated with the same urgency;
- Mol: agreement in Dubai: para. 32: recognize that the extent depends on the extent of means of implementation;
- Mapping: Option B.?: need to compile existing indicators and formulation of a compilation and tracking and monitoring of Mol;
- Experts: lot of challenges how this would work and how Party experts can be part of this, and that it's not limited to a small number of people deciding things; must include all Parties' experts; for developing country experts support would be needed;
- [...]
- Some options have specific timelines, but other don't. What's the process of compilation and updating it?
- Criteria for indicators: some are criteria, others are guidance, some are relevant, others are not; best to divide them into: 1. criteria for menu of options; 2. criteria for global indicators; 3. guidance to the SB Chairs. Criteria must be adaptation-relevant; just relying on public data could be misleading;
- Data availability: not appropriate; global nature: of course; aggregability: not relevant; multilateral processes alignment: not a criterium - our work could include some of these, but only those that are very adaptation-relevant - if this is a criteria then we cannot go beyond that's already there, but our work here is to develop something appropriate for this FW;
- We hear some mention budgetary discussions that need to happen; any discussion has its own agenda item; the discussion on the budget should be there, and not in an adaptation room; other rooms are also not doing budgetary presentations;

GHANA:

- Mol: I've been on the ground, been part of this team. It's time we all act in cohesion. This issue of pick and choose and then act is not going to be applicable. Any text without means of implementation is not complete, and we'll fight it to the last.

NEW ZEALAND:

- Good text
- AC is good to do the mapping; cost implications of options are needed;
- Mol inclusion is a concern; but finance is not GGA FW target; that's negotiated separately in the finance rooms; including them would prejudice the negotiations on the new finance goal;
- [...]

MEXICO:

- Very important to mention IPs, people with disability; we're open, in part 8.u, to add "other vulnerable groups"

NORWAY:

- Also need to decide how to use the indicators (but not at this session)

- AC should be the motor and could engage several experts;

FACILITATOR:

- Many wanted streamlining;
- We'll produce a new iteration of the text to merge options, X and reflect views about making things more accurate;
- Next slot: Saturday, hopefully a double one...