

SBSTA 5 (a)/SBI 11(a) – Global Goal on Adaptation

Notes [Laila Darouich], darouich@perspectives.cc

Informal Consultations -Nov 15

Agenda Item	SBSTA 5 (a)/SBI 11(a)
Date	15.11.2024
Time	12:00 - 14:00
Chair(s)	Tina Kobilsek (Slovenia) and Lamin Dibba (Gambia)
Dynamic	Constructive
Key outcomes of session/Progress achieved during session	○ Purpose of meeting was to receive general reflections of the draft text circulated the night prior to the session. ○ Streamlining and Structure: Many Parties emphasized the need to streamline the text, eliminate duplications, and improve its structure to make it more concise and manageable. There was broad agreement that the current text is too long, contains redundancies, and needs to be organized more clearly with proper headings. ○ Timeline and Guidance for Experts: There was consensus on the need for a clear and well-communicated timeline for the expert groups to complete their work, with guidance on refining and developing indicators. ○ MOI indicators remain a central point of contention. Developing countries (e.g., AGN, Egypt) insisted on including MOI indicators. Developed countries, like Japan and the EU, argued that MOI indicators fall outside the mandate of the UAE-Belem work programme. ○ Transformational Adaptation: There was a reluctance from several Parties (AGN, Egypt, LMDC, Arab Group) to engage with the TA section, arguing that the report came too late and it is not a priority at this stage.

Introduction

Cofacilitator [Tina]

- Text drafted and published last night
- Some paras that are quite similar, could be streamlined
- Some options contain clearly diverging views, other options are offering differing possibilities that could be combined
- Some editorial mistakes, will in future iteration be fixed
- Zero draft version
- Invite today to provide reflections on text and we hope that it can serve as a basis for discussion

Interventions

GROUP/ COUNTRY	NAME (IF POSSIBLE)	INTERVENTION
Uruguay obo grupo sur		• Too long and duplicative but workable • Some examples, 8, 28, 32,35,39,40 • We propose 55 indicators with MOI indicators • We request the cofac to adhere to the text of Bonn • Criteria (streamline p.27 b,c,f) • Use of a matrix, we leave to experts • Timeline of 2. Year of WP: 41-61 indicators by March, in mind of the criteria, workshop will take place, engagement with experts, commenting on the list, by may should deliver final list, SB62, in person workshop in September/October • Outcome of WP: options ballooned, streamlining needed • Para on MOI is not correctly structured • We can submit views written • Discuss further in inf inf
Samoa obo AOSIS		• We would have appreciated more time but agree to work on text • Many repetitive paras • P.6 took note instead of welcome • P8 4 weeks prior instead of 4-6 • P.9 option 1 • P.11 other indicator criteria outcome and output focused should be for p.9 • P.14 & 16 to be removed • P. 18 instead of “whiles proposing indicators that reflect trends” • P.24 option 2 • Remove p.28 • P.29 consolidated with p.27 • Remove 032 • P. 33 Option 3 • P.35 a,e,f support. 5 indicators per target • P.36 a • P.39 remove • P.44 a,c,d,e • Remove p.46,48, 59 • Para on TA: all • Can submit views in written format • Discussion in inf infs
Turkey		• Thanks for draft • Emphasize as a long term process as standalone agenda item • Indicators specific to children

EU		• Didn't have sufficient time to go into details • Some concerns with the text but we are willing to engage with text • High level reflections: quite long, many options, can be streamlined, some paras that are alternatives are not listed as options and others are options but should be options – to be changed in new iteration • 3 sections – section on indicators should have headers ○ Final outcome of WP ○ Concise list of indicators, guide work of experts ○ Sub-header on criteria ○ Product of Sb62 ○ Exchange with experts • We don't want to micromanage the experts; SB chairs should tell experts what to do • Section on P.38: ○ Alternative p.52 ○ P.55, option • Section on TA: option 3, like AOSIS
Russia		• P.7 • P.15 duplicate • P.20 - Indicators should be manageable, no number of indicators to be mentioned, premature • Additions to para 27 • P.32 further discussions needed • P.34 option 1 • New para after P.41: mountains, permafrost etc. • Are there financial indicators in the database?
AGN		• Avoid confusion, guide experts in meaningful way • Highlight the need for streamlining, concise text • Integration of MOI indicators – red line • Agree to p.36, change agree with decides, keep a,e • Indicators should allow aggregation of information • Note that aggregation and disaggregation is relevant for all parties • CBRD-RC, unfair transfer of burden needs to be reflected in text • Criteria not from Bonn but from workshop in October, not helpful to use old criteria • P.20 – narrowing down, 10 indicators per target as maximum • P.41 vague language, need to be specific, adaptation focused indicators • On timeline: expert to submit work well in advance of SB62 • Standalone agenda item on GGA • On TA: report came too late, we are not willing to engage on this, we are not against it but it is not part of our priorities, we need to first close implementation gap – option A – no text

		• P38 linkage GGA – GST – merge options 2,4,6 • P.61 – option 1 • We do not renegotiate framework, but review of framework needs to be discussed, we want include MOI
South Africa		• Align with AGN • Very difficult to follow the text, inputs are provided • We need to improve structuring • How to structure: thanking everyone, guidance to experts (clear timelines) • Allow for political process on final product • P.1-9 workable • P.10 emphasize need for a common approach, delete mentioning of data consolidation • P.11 – follow criteria: remove all mentioning of systematic approach • P.15 report with further criteria that we define here at COP • P. 18,19,20 streamline into 1 para • P.22 delete • P.26 modify: where we talk in person workshop, invite for the parties, further finalize the work of the indicators, drawing from the technical work done by experts, upon receipt of final outcome • P.27: not restate guidance of SB60, more focused “on the basis of the guidance provided at SB60, we want to provide more guidance” • Indicators that are global in nature, aggregatable, ... • P.33 – outcome of final report: report of the mapping and refining technical report - papa is confusing, need to be clear • P.34 option 3: global in nature, relevant in local • On p.38 – delete p.52 – no more work on AC, we don’t give them money to work on this, so we cannot overload them • P.61 we agree on further clarification on TOR needed, review of framework, review will take after GST2 • On TA: delete, premature
Chile obo AILAC		• Refine text, duplications • P.1-5 okay • P.6 we need to consider • P.9 option 1 • P.18 considering • P.21 try instead of ensure • P.22 careful to avoid refine indicators that are already adopted • P.29 a, e • P.32 e not acceptable • P.34 duplications in the options, we have another option: • P.35 a,c,e,f option 2

		• P.36 should be options, e okay • P.40 concern – we are willing to discuss more • P.44 option 1 • P.43 and p.44 a timeline would be important, c and d • P.46 regarding spreadsheet with metadata, we should make this after we finalized indicators • P.48 we understand that this refers to final outcome of work • P.49 option 2 • P.51 option 1
US		• 2 general reflections: 1. how you as co-fac – what do you want in the conclusions of the SBs, all of this text or only some? 2. Structure of doc: 1. Thanking 2. Additional refinement is needed 3. Elements of final outcome 4. How should experts do their work • Streamlining of text, avoid duplications • P.9 option 1 retained • P.11 parties to ask SB chairs to ask experts what do to • P. 27 and 32 – streamlining • P.33 – option 1 • P.34 multiple concepts that are very similar – retain option 4 • p.36 option 6 • p.49 option 3 • p.51 option 1 • p.52 option 1 • p.53 option 1 • p.54 and 55 we are willing to engage on substance of the para • p.60 option 1 • p.61 option 3 • section on TA: agree with AOSIS
Egypt		• streamlining • structure proposed by AGN is good • on indicators: we agree to all papas on MOI • experts to develop indicators on MOI • p.34 option 3 • 10 indicators max per target • P.36 a,b • P.38 aggregation of indicator, not to be fed into GST, all parties need aggregation and disaggregation • P.49 option 2 • P.52 option 2 • Option 1 on TORs • On TA: no text option, not the right time to discuss this
Japan		• We were not able to fully analyze the text • We can only offer general texts: duplications, problems with structure, MOI indicators cannot support bc outside of mandate of UAE Belem WP • Text as starting point

		• We support inf infs • Delete duplications • Deliverables will facilitate GST
Indonesia		• Streamlining needed • We will engage with text • P.9 option 2 • P.26 option 2 – remove last part of the para (already stated in another para) • P.24 option 2 • P.34 option 1 • P.49 option 2 • P.51 option 2 • P.52 option 1 • P.60 option 4 • P.61 option 1 • On TA: no text, bc for now we need to focus on other elements (indicators)
Mexico obo EIG		• Text is solid foundations • Text too long, duplications, streamlining needed • We need more opportunities to engage • Include traditional knowledge next to best available science • Gender balance next to geographical balance
Saudi Arabia obo Arab Group		• Structure of text is confusing, subtitles, options • Some of our input has been slightly modified see p.50/51 option 1 – I will send you the correct version • P.9 option 2 • P.10 agree with AGN • P.18 we have an issue with reducing nr of indicators, not relevant • P.20 not agree to specific number of 55, premature • P.22 adaptation relevant indicator • P.23 option 2 • P. 24 option 2 • P. 26 good • P.32 a • P.33 option 2 • P.34 option 1 • P. 35 a,b priority • ... • P.36 we go with a,b • P.37 rewording, will send • P.38 agree with AGN, delete SIDS and LDCs • P.39 important to keep • P.38 – option 2 -standalone GGA agenda item • P.51 option 2 • P.52 delete • P.53 option 2

		• P.54 options do not reflect all input reflected in writing, option 4 is something we can work with • P.55 option 1 • On TA: no text, no time to reflect on text, text sent to late
China obo LMDC		• Missed some parts • On TA: same sentiment as AGN • No heading to highlight which part belongs to indicator work • Clear structure for topics in text • Indicators: confusion, quite difficult to follow logic, within indicator section • Guidance to expert group: p.10-12, 32,41 – similar meaning • There is also guidance to expert group on timeline: p.44-48 and p. – • Paras 32-37 + 40 are on final outcome • Refine text tonight, that we can continue soon
LDC		• Missed the rest