

Co-chairs' summary of the Presidencies' consultations on adaptation

9 March 2022, 8:00 – 10:00 and 21:00 – 23:00 CET (two sessions)

Introduction

As part of the regular series of informal multilateral consultations convened by the presidencies through 2022, we held consultations for Heads of Delegation on Adaptation on 9 March 2022.

We were delighted by the active engagement and substantive contributions made by Parties. They made it clear that the recently published contribution of Working Group II to the 6th Assessment Report of the IPCC provides an important framing and the scientific basis for this and the following years' adaptation agenda. As the report underlines, the window of opportunity for adaptation and mitigation action is closing rapidly which poses risks to sustainable development for all. In this context, Parties called for urgent action on and support for adaptation and the transition to a decade of implementation.

We were pleased to have opening remarks by the Subsidiary Body Chairs who emphasized the need for assembling the pieces of the adaptation puzzle which have been developed over the years in the form of different processes and institutional arrangements. They also stressed the importance of developing a more common understanding of adaptation and progress on it. Finally, they called on Parties to actively contribute to the implementation of the Glasgow–Sharm el-Sheikh work programme on the global goal on adaptation by sharing their views by means of submissions and the planned workshops.

Prior to the consultations we issued the following three guiding questions to structure the conversation:

1. What needs to happen in 2022 and by COP27 to make progress on adaptation? What outcomes at COP27 are needed to achieve that?
2. What are your expectations for the Glasgow–Sharm el-Sheikh work programme on the global goal on adaptation at COP27 and beyond? What would an ambitious outcome look like?
3. How can NDCs, national adaptation plans and adaptation communications support enhanced action on adaptation and a better understanding of progress on adaptation?

Parties shared very specific views and proposals on these questions and also highlighted some other issues that they considered important.

Progress on adaptation in 2022

In response to the question on what needs to happen in 2022 and by COP 27 to make progress on adaptation, Parties highlighted the importance of following up on the key adaptation-related provisions of the decisions of the COP26 and CMA3, as well as the Glasgow Climate Pact and of transitioning from planning to the implementation of adaptation. For this to happen they underlined the need for countering the slow pace of formulating and implementing National Adaptation Plans (NAPs), including for least developed countries (LDCs), Small Island Developing States (SIDS) and Africa, and making progress in coming forth with ambitious adaptation action and support for implementation including through NAPs, Adaptation Communications and Nationally Determined

Contributions (NDCs). In this context, many Parties stressed the need for developed country Parties to scale up the provision of predictable, accessible and needs-based climate finance, knowledge transfer, technological support and capacity building for developing country Parties. Some further stressed the need for public finance for adaptation in grant form. Some Parties also raised that both public and private finance efforts needed to be strengthened. Some Parties emphasized the growing adaptation gaps and are expecting clear signals from developed country Parties in 2022 on how they will increase adaptation finance commensurate with their promise to double the amount by 2025, and make bolder commitments beyond doubling.

Many Parties also underscored the importance for all major economies to submit revised NDCs in 2022 with ambitious targets for 2030 that align with the 1.5 temperature goal to lower the need for adaptation. In this context, the significant linkages and co-benefits between mitigation and adaptation were emphasized which require greater attention. In addition, linkages between adaptation, mitigation and ecosystem restoration and other nature-based solutions were highlighted by several Parties.

Some Parties also saw the progress to be made by the Adaptation Committee as an important input to progress on adaptation in 2022. This included the progress on implementing the key mandates that emerged from the Paris Agreement in support of the first global stocktake, including with the engagement of the IPCC, and on important aspects of its work plan, which would also feed into the review of the progress, effectiveness and performance of the Adaptation Committee at COP 27.

Some Parties called for enhanced discussions and action on establishing enabling environments, the absence of which was an important drawback for adaptation action in developing countries, particularly in LDCs. Other Parties recommended the organization of a series of regional dialogues to define most urgent needs of all countries.

In terms of outcomes needed from COP 27 to deliver progress on adaptation, some Parties suggested the following elements could form an overarching adaptation outcome to be adopted at COP 27: (i) Key take-aways from the IPCC WG II contribution to AR 6, including on limits to adaptation; (ii) Progress made on adaptation finance since COP 26; (iii) Progress capturing substantive work on the GGA in 2022; (iv) Adaptation and technology linkages; and (v) Progress of work on the Adaptation Committee's mandates.

Some Parties highlighted a request and guidance to the operating entities of the Financial Mechanism to provide adequate finance for the entire process of formulating and implementing NAPs, including for monitoring, evaluation and reporting. Some also called for streamlined criteria for specific constituencies, including Africa and LDCs, to access the promised adaptation finance. Furthermore, several Parties pointed to the necessity of ensuring effectiveness, sustainability and efficiency of the Adaptation Fund and the provision of adequate and predictable resources for it. In this regard it was mentioned that clarity on the operationalization of Article 6 was required to enable the share proceeds for adaptation.

One Party called for an additional decision that would highlight the importance of regional cooperation for adaptation. The Koronivia Joint Work on Agriculture was also mentioned by some Parties as a factor to be considered in the delivery of adaptation-related mandates.

Some Parties suggested including a focus on thematic areas in the organization of COP 27, such as desertification and water, as well as sectoral initiatives that address specific adaptation needs. Others proposed to consider related items such as adaptation, finance and technology in joint discussions. Processes-wise, some Parties requested to avoid overlaps when scheduling adaptation agenda items to enable small delegations to participate throughout.

Expectations for the Glasgow–Sharm el-Sheikh work programme on the global goal on adaptation

Parties concurred that the work programme provides a good opportunity to address adaptation as a global challenge that requires efforts at the global, regional, national and local levels and the linking of global with local perspectives. It was further referred to by some Parties as a good opportunity for sharing ideas and deepening engagement on adaptation as well as for moving from incremental to systemic approaches. Furthermore, other Parties see it as a suitable platform for assessing needs related to adaptation as well as for identifying its costs and for removing barriers for accessing adaptation finance. Many Parties also underlined that the work programme will enable a better understanding of adaptation and some suggested it could support its measurement at an aggregate level.

In this context, some Parties shared the view that it will not be possible to come up with a common set of indicators to review progress on adaptation globally, but that instead the work programme could help to create a common understanding on adaptation as well as the collective progress on it as well as to identify areas towards which more investment needs to be channelled and what the issues are that still hinder adaptation at the national and local level.

In terms of what needs to be achieved in 2022, some Parties referred to a deeper understanding of a range of issues, including: (i) common and region/area-specific vulnerabilities based on IPCC findings; (ii) national experiences, e.g. in putting in place relevant policies, and related common challenges and ways to overcome them; (iii) methodologies that can help to review progress (supported by work of the AC and the IPCC report) and (iv) the role of tipping points for adaptation.

In more practical terms, some Parties called for an immediate start of the work under the work programme in order to yield substantive outcomes in time for COP 27, emphasizing that work is already delayed. It was also pointed out that Parties should be urged to put forward Adaptation Communications and other national reports such as NDCs, National Communications, as well as planning and implementation national documents, in particular NAPs so as to allow for a holistic view on countries' lessons learned, best practices and key opportunities on adaptation as well as for enhancing mutual understanding of Parties' combined efforts.

Concrete proposals were made for conducting the workshops planned in 2022. These included focusing on clusters of objectives and/or logical flows e.g. the first workshop could focus on enhancing understanding of the GGA, the second on ways to review progress, etc. Some Parties saw this sequencing as a good approach for enabling Parties to agree, at COP 27, on criteria and principles to review progress towards the goal as part of GST 1, also taking into account previous work by the Adaptation Committee. In addition, some parties indicated that key principles and relevant provisions of the Convention and the Paris Agreement should guide the implementation of the work programme; they mentioned in particular equity, CBDR, Party-drivenness, and other priorities including sustainable development and poverty eradication.

It was mentioned that other aspects of the work programme could be left to 2023, noting that all objectives of the work programme must be fully set out in order to inform the GST and to make an essential contribution towards enhancing action on adaptation and support. Some Parties were in favour of a concrete decision on the GGA to be adopted by COP 27/CMA 4 and were of the view that this decision would need to capture the elements highlighted in the workshops and address the gaps and needs of developing countries for adaptation, with concrete steps towards enhancing adaptation support, including finance, technology transfer, and capacity building. Some Parties said a clear decision on the substantive progress made under the work programme would facilitate a strong

outcome at COP 28. Other Parties said the focus at COP27 should be on stocktaking progress on the work programme with a substantive decision at COP28.

Regarding the organizational aspects of the workshops, it was underlined that they will need to be organized in a way that allows smaller delegations and all developing countries to participate. There were divergent views, however, on how this could be ensured. While some Parties favoured the conduct of the workshops in person or in a hybrid format before the SB sessions in June, some argued that this could lead to clashes with pre-session group consultations and would prolong the time during which delegates would be absent from their families. These Parties favoured the virtual format or shorter in-session workshops, while others expressed concern over the challenges of virtual workshops to achieving progress

Views were also exchanged on the inclusion of a dedicated agenda item on “Matters related to the Glasgow–Sharm el-Sheikh work programme on adaptation” on the agenda of SB 56 in June 2022. Views ranged from support of the proposal with a view to delivering a substantive decision at CMA 4 as a first milestone, through the addition of a standing agenda item on the GGA on both the SB as well as the CMA agendas. Other Parties argued against the inclusion of the item on the June SB agendas as this might lead to further negotiations on the work programme instead of facilitating practical discussions on the GGA.

Overall, there were calls for conducting the work programme in an inclusive manner and in a way that would not pose any additional burden on developing countries, as enshrined in the respective decision from Glasgow. It was also mentioned that it should ensure the participation of non-party stakeholders such as youth and indigenous peoples and consider gender aspects, Africa’s special needs and circumstances, and transboundary issues. In addition, some Parties recalled the essential contributions that bodies and institutional arrangements such as the Adaptation Committee and the Nairobi work programme could make towards a successful outcome of the work programme. Calls were also heard for applying innovative approaches when designing aspects of the work programme, such as the workshops. Some Parties mentioned the need for more clarity on the procedure for assessing the work of the work programme and on how the information will be incorporated into the first and subsequent GSTs.

The role of NDCs, NAPs and adaptation communications in supporting enhanced adaptation and a better understanding of progress

Parties were in agreement that the GST is a key milestone for adaptation, including for taking stock of adaptation finance and needs and persisting challenges faced by developing countries in implementing adaptation, and that Adaptation Communications, NDCs, and NAPs, need to be recognized as important vehicles for Parties to communicate their plans and support needs for implementation.

In this regard, some Parties underlined that Parties should be encouraged to support developing countries to formulate and subsequently implement their NAPs, Adaptation Communications and NDCs, to communicate their priorities, needs, and progress in planning and implementing adaptation and to share outstanding support needs and challenges as well as to enable learning. The different vehicles of both planning and implementation, as well as communication, were seen as being helpful for building coherence on adaptation and for facilitating bottom-up reviews of progress under the GST. In this context, the supplementary guidelines for Adaptation Communications being developed by the Adaptation Committee were highlighted as an opportunity to help bring more consistency across the different communication channels. Some parties highlighted the need for support to be

provided to developing countries to develop and implement their adaptation plans and communications.

In more concrete terms, one Party proposed that, starting from their second Adaptation Communication and NDCs, Parties could communicate how their previously communicated needs have been addressed to allow for a better understanding of progress. Another Party emphasized that the state of play on planning and implementing NAPs and NDCs in Africa will serve as an indicator to assess progress on adaptation globally. As a crosscutting aspect, it was pointed out that more and better data proves to be a challenge, particularly for developing countries, while being required for adequate reporting.