

### **Intervention on the Glasgow–Sharm el-Sheikh work programme on the global goal on adaptation referred to in decision 7/CMA.3**

India thanks the cofacilitators for their note recognizing that it does not represent consensus but is a collection of views. We too, as many others, have serious concerns about the note.

India aligns itself with the intervention by Suriname on behalf of G77&China and China on behalf of LMDC. We want to make a few additional points in our national capacity.

We believe that adaptation is an ongoing process and the goals must be thought of as dynamic, linked to both, capacity to adapt and the degree of risks from impact.

Setting global goals for the reduction of vulnerability and reduced mortality from extreme events and climate-related disasters is absolutely necessary, but any goal on such outcomes, will have to be absolute in nature – such as say reducing mortality to zero for example. We cannot have a halfway target here as this would not be ethical. It is incumbent upon us, as Governments to ensure that not a single person is left behind. We may not always be able to achieve this in specific instances due to multiple reasons, but as a goal, we cannot have anything less than this.

For this reason, we believe that we should have an overarching target and must have output-oriented indicators, instead of outcome-oriented targets. For example, we think the 100% coverage of all regions with early warning systems is a good example of an output oriented indicator. Similarly, the enhancement of health infrastructure and co-operation for the same, across regions, would be another good output indicator. We can also have output-oriented targets for the expansion of disaster resilient infrastructure. India has undertaken significant efforts to pursue collaborative efforts in this regard through the Coalition for Disaster Resilient Infrastructure.

We also think that while conservation is important in its own right, its inclusion as an adaptation target is counter-productive. Land, forests, water resources are intimately connected to human systems. There is significant dependence of indigenous and local communities on these resources. There can be serious tradeoffs here that need to be managed and adaptation for local and indigenous peoples cannot be simply put under an umbrella of ecosystem conservation. This would exacerbate the problem of adaptation for these communities.

India is also very concerned about the implications of such targets which are very often used as a means for mitigation, using the forests of the global South as sinks for industrial emissions of the global North. We would therefore not be in favour of such global goals that seek to either directly or indirectly link mitigation to adaptation action. We are now especially concerned about this given the calls for the removal of references to the Convention and its principles of equity and CBDR&RC.

Lastly, while we understand that we must learn from other multilateral processes and take into account issues that are relevant, we believe that each multilateral process has its own targets based on the core objectives of those conventions and processes. We must be careful about simply borrowing targets from other conventions as they may apply differentially in the context of adaptation to climate change.