

ADP: Addressing adaptation and loss and damage

Bonn, 12 June (TWN) – The contact group for the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (ADP) on Saturday, 8 June focused on the topic of adaptation and loss and damage. Parties engaged actively on the topic of how to address adaptation and loss and damage under the new agreement to be concluded in Paris next year.

Parties presented a number of proposals on how to address adaptation and loss and damage in the new agreement, including:

- A global goal for adaptation (South Africa and the African Group)
- An adaptation mechanism
- An adaptation registry
- A Subsidiary Body for Adaptation – SBA (China)
- Integrating adaptation action into intended nationally determined contributions (Brazil)
- Adaptation elements in the Conference Room Paper (CRP. 1) tabled by the Like-Minded Developing Countries (LMDC).

To start the discussion, the ADP co-chairs, Kishan Kumarsingh (Trinidad and Tobago) and Artur Runge-Metzger (the European Union), had prepared a slide with bullet points under three headings: Long-term and collective aspects of adaptation; commitments/contributions; institutional arrangements, cooperation and coordination.

Bhutan, speaking on behalf of the **Least Developed Countries**, emphasized the importance of implementation of adaptation. Needs and costs will rise steeply with increasing temperature. Adaptation will be impossible in some places at temperatures above 2C.

Bhutan said that adaptation and loss and damage, along with means of implementation and support must be part of a future agreement. It

noted that collaboration on adaptation is a legal requirement under the Convention. There is a need for implementing, improving, and strengthening institutions of the Convention to work on the ground. The Least Developed Countries Expert Group (LEG) and elements of the LDC work programme should continue. The Warsaw International Mechanism on Loss and Damage and future loss and damage institutions should be integrated into a future agreement. Support for adaptation is a right, not a contribution, and that there was no need for intended nationally determined contributions (INDCs) on adaptation. It said that the main reason for INDCs was to make sure we are on the right path for emission reductions.

Egypt, speaking on behalf of the **LMDC**, introduced the elements of the group's CRP. 1. The text contains seven paragraphs on enhanced action on adaptation. It references Article 4.4 of the Convention on the provision of financing from developed country Parties and Annex II Parties as the basis for adaptation action of developing countries. Developing country adaptation actions are to be on the basis of National Adaptation Plans (NAPs) supported by developed country Parties and Annex II Parties' financing. It proposed strengthening of Convention adaptation-related mechanisms, including having an adaptation registry. Developed country Parties and Annex II Parties are to provide financing for adaptation in developing countries. It proposed enhanced national and international adaptation, including economic diversification to build resilience, to be supported by developed country Parties and Annex II Parties' financing.

It said the Warsaw Loss and Damage Mechanism should be incorporated into the 2015 agreed outcome with provision of financing from developed country Parties and Annex II Parties.

Enhanced action to address loss and damage requires support for the efficient development and operationalization of approaches to address loss and damage from climate impacts.

Nauru, speaking on behalf of the **Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS)**, said that Article 4.4 provided the legal basis for financial means of meeting adaptation costs of small island developing states (SIDS) and other vulnerable countries. It said that ambitious and timely mitigation was important for levels of adaptation needed and to prevent permanent loss, and defining the relationship between these would be key. Mitigation and adaptation must be treated in a balanced manner, recognizing the relationship with adaptation cost.

On commitments and contributions, it should be recognized that the need to adapt is an additional development burden. NAPs are a country-driven process with a focus on ensuring implementation actions on the ground. It goes beyond planning and mainstreaming,

The treatment of adaptation under the Convention is fragmented and piecemeal. The Adaptation Committee should be the main body under the Convention, strengthened so it has coordination coherence. It should be linked with the technology mechanism, the LEG, and in particular with a strong linkage to the Green Climate Fund (GCF) and other existing funds.

Nauru reiterated that the level of funding required will depend on the mitigation scenario undertaken. It said there should be long-term, scaled-up, new and predictable financing to cover the costs of loss and damage. It said there should be a monitoring and review mechanism in terms of support provided for adaptation and to record experience gained and lessons learned in vulnerable developing countries.

Sudan, speaking on behalf of the **African Group**, said the Convention provides for cooperative actions, with specific treaty obligations for specific Parties, and referenced Articles 3.1, 3.2, 4.4, 4.5, and 4.8, as well as decision 1/CP.16 (Cancun Conference). It mentioned the importance to the 2015 agreement for ex ante assessment of adaptation needs, based on a global temperature goal. It said the provision of support through the financial mechanism will play a significant role. There should be a link between mitigation ambition and adaptation, and there is a need to understand

the costs associated with impacts deriving from different emission pathways and scenarios. It mentioned national responses in the context of this broader view, including the NAPs process and other technology and adaptation needs assessments, reaffirming the need for developed country support and decision 5/CP.17 (Durban Conference).

Developed countries will provide support and qualify their terms of support, assumptions made, and sectors and regions covered. There would be an ex post assessment of support, reflecting adequacy, adaptation options, and associated investment costs.

A platform for adaptation could provide for recording climate impact costs, ex ante assessments of developing country adaptation costs, and adaptation finance needed for most vulnerable groups. NAPs should be the entry point for adaptation support, and there should be measurement, reporting and verification (MRV) of support. Adaptation support should be reflected as a legally binding commitment. There is a need for the agreement to acknowledge the responsibility of developed countries for sustainable, adequate and predictability of finance and technology provided.

The Philippines noted two important places in the Convention related to adaptation. First, Article 4.1(d) – what are we going to do – and second, Article 4.4. It said the only articles in the Convention directly related to adaptation relate to funding. Article 2, the ultimate objective of the Convention, mentions essential parameters towards a long-term goal – within a time frame that would allow effective adaptation. It said it would not be possible to have an overarching goal for specific adaptation actions. There were significant uncertainties of science, and in such a situation it was not possible to predict specifically what adaptation actions would be taken. It questioned using a global temperature goal to frame national adaptation actions, as the world is not probably going to reach this goal. It was, however, possible to have an overarching goal in terms of support, based on level of mitigation. If the mitigation goal is not reached, what is the aggregate cost to address the situation?

Under Article 4.4, developed countries shall help countries to meet full costs of adaptation to the adverse effects of climate change. Discussions on

contributions with respect to adaptation need to be framed in the context of Article 4.4. It noted that adaptation finance is currently in crisis. The Adaptation Fund was established in Marrakech and is the only fund that provides for concrete adaptation activities. It cannot be viable without a viable second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol. A significant share of new funding for adaptation should flow through the GCF.

The Philippines said adequate, new and additional finance should support adaptation action in all interested developing countries, including through support for formulation of NAPs. It pointed to the obligation of developed country parties to deliver adequate and predictable funding, addressing the historical imbalance in the provision of financial resources, and operationalizing 1/CP.16, paragraph 100.

It also noted the special importance of Article 12.3, where countries must report details of measures taken in the implementation of obligations. An adaptation registry could be created to present their cases.

Under institutional arrangements there should be a provision that includes the loss and damage mechanism in the 2015 outcome, with operationalization of approaches such as social safety nets and social protection programs. Despite the mention of loss and damage here, while it is inherent to the discussion on adaptation, loss and damage must be considered additional to and separate from adaptation. The agreement should provide for specific commitments from Annex II countries for the operationalization of loss and damage mechanism. With regards to other international actions on adaptation, it said that diversification and management of natural resources should also be provided with finance.

Chile, speaking on behalf of **Independent Alliance for the Latin American and Caribbean (AILAC)**, said there was a need for a long-term aspirational objective, going beyond resilience. It wanted to see a process launched that could assess progress towards a goal, with methodologies and indicators. Parties would all commit to global adaptation, according to nationally determined priorities. Bodies like the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) could facilitate complete implementation, assisting countries to better assess their vulnerabilities, contributing to a better

understanding of modeling scenarios and understanding of what to do, and the methodological dimension and metrics of monitoring.

It was time, it said to seriously implement what has already been agreed, maybe through the Adaptation Committee. It said the Warsaw Mechanism for Loss and Damage is independent and needs to be fully implemented and delivered.

Bangladesh said there were two elements of loss and damage: slow onset events and events beyond adaptation. For countries that are flat, impacts have already been felt in coastal areas. It said slow onset events have to be addressed right now. Then there is the element beyond adaptation. With adaptation there is a need to consider the timescale, and a need for baseline and global numbers in terms of financing. It said links should be made with finance, technology, and capacity building.

Brazil said it was important to start thinking about how to frame the issue of adaptation: how are we going to include adaptation under the new agreement and what is the role of the new agreement in terms of promoting adaptation. It said currently the system does not give equal or balanced priority to the different elements, and they wanted to strike that balance. It said that was their starting point – how does the new agreement contribute to creating that balance. There was a need to find a way to give a boost to adaptation to correct the imbalance.

It pointed also to Article 4.4, the commitment accepted by Annex II parties on meeting the costs of adaptation, asking how the agreement could establish a clear mechanism or instrument or give a boost to existing instruments to implement this commitment to the desired level. On a global goal for adaptation, Brazil said it had a lot of doubts about that concept. There were methodological issues around how to calculate the aggregate costs of impacts and aggregate needs of countries that made it difficult to reach agreement around a global goal. Adaptation is evolving in nature and every day there is a different need. It said it is not clever to establish a global goal which is evolving.

One idea which could be further discussed is a methodological approach for quantification of adaptation costs. It said that adaptation in itself is a right of Parties and communities, including having access to means of implementation and

to technologies to adapt to climate change. We should not burden ourselves with the global goal but seek to provide the means for adaptation. There is a need to be careful to not reinvent what is in the Convention, as it is our guide. We are not revising it, but trying to implement what is already said. As mitigation levels will have an impact on adaptation required, it suggested we could work on the basis of a global objective of mitigation and adaptation in terms of a temperature limit.

Brazil said it understood that the INDCs would become the backbone of the agreement. Therefore if the collective will is to provide more importance to adaptation, it was important to have adaptation reflected in the information of the INDCs, as we are talking about two sides of the same coin, to mainstream adaptation in the agreement through the INDCs. It said it is not trying to create an overburden, but rather to provide parties with an opportunity to showcase their needs, actions, and plans that are nationally determined.

India said it needed to understand the global goal and the thinking of countries that had proposed it. It said also there was a need to begin with a common understanding of how adaptation is addressed and would be linked to INDCs. Each country could indicate its adaptation action as part of its contribution. Developing countries face significant adaptation costs, due to historical emissions of developed countries. Countries should indicate their needs for support, technology, and capacity building. The Cancun Adaptation Framework provides a starting point and we must look to it to enhance institutional understanding. Under the framework countries have a mandate for preparing NAPs. It said there should be consideration of widening the scope of the framework for enhancing institutional capacity and understanding and strategies for enhancing NAPs. It also noted that adaptation has co-benefits in terms of mitigation.

India said that Annex II Parties should be required to indicate their contributions in terms of adaptation support to finance, technology transfer, and capacity building, based on provisions of convention. What is missing from the schema on screen is a clear link with the Convention. How do articles 4.4, 4.8, 4.9 and implementing action get articulated under enhanced action on adaptation?

On institutional arrangements, it called attention to the limitations of the Adaptation Fund, that the existing mechanism is not able to meet a fraction of the requirements, with respect to dependence on finance from 2% of Certified Emission Reductions. It said the Adaptation Fund should be strengthened in the agreement. It noted that the GCF was in the process of being operationalized, and that the funding allocation should be 50:50 between mitigation and adaptation. It proposed funding preparations and updating of NAPs, technology transfer, best practices, and knowledge hubs. It noted the delay in making the GCF fully functional was costly and any delay in action was adding to this cost and it was urgent to act. It supported the idea of setting up an adaptation registry.

China said that with regard to adaptation, there are a number of important provisions in the Convention, starting with Article 2 with regard to food security and sustainable development. There is a need to act within a time frame to allow ecosystems to naturally adapt to the impact of climate change, ensure food production, and enable economic development to proceed in a sustainable manner. It also referred to various provisions of the Convention. On institutional arrangements, there are some arrangements under the Convention and its Protocol, such as the Adaptation Fund. The new agreement should coordinate and strengthen institutions and existing arrangements. The AC is relevant up until 2020, but might not be adequate or sufficient to undertake all the tasks needed for enhanced action on adaptation. It suggested to create a Subsidiary Body on Adaptation (SBA). The SBA could coordinate some of the elements put forward by Parties in an adaptation assessment framework.

Saudi Arabia said mitigation and adaptation were two sides of the same coin. It said there is a need to strengthen the institutions we have right now, and not replace what is needed post-2020,

South Africa said that a global goal was an essential part of the new agreement. In line with common but differentiated responsibilities (CBDR), it would include enhanced commitments, including a commitment for all Parties to formulate NAPs, and for enhanced action on finance, technology and capacity-building through existing institutions and mechanisms. Parties with additional obligations under Article 4.4 must contribute to the

development of NAPs and the costs of those NAPs in developing countries. The AC would provide guidance and its role would be strengthened. It said loss and damage must be substantially addressed. With regard to information for INDCs, all Parties would provide information on impacts, methodologies, assumptions and associated costs; adaptation planning options; technology needs and associated costs; information on programs and projects, international and regional cooperation, and support, including means of implementation. It said there was a need for a system for recognition of contributions.

Kenya said it is useful to have a broad objective, such as building adaptive capacities of societies. This is a global responsibility and a collective commitment of Parties. On commitments and contributions it said it is better to have the contributions as part of INDCs. There is a need for developed countries to submit information on their support for adaptation and a process to assess the adequacy of that support and the gap is envisaged. It suggested to strengthen existing institutions and ensure that adaptation is well coordinated under the Convention. Loss and damage should be included in the new agreement.

Peru suggested there was a need to effectively enhance adaptation and enable climate resilience and these should be part of the package of elements towards Lima. It said that it is not helpful to mirror adaptation and mitigation as is found in the document on intended nationally determined contributions that the co-chairs had produced. For example, using time frames was not good or appropriate when considering adaptation.

Colombia agreed with the importance of having adaptation in the agreement, with a need to focus on how the adaptation provisions will translate into adaptation on the ground. It said that both adaptation and mitigation are a matter of global priority. Given no agreed metrics, there should be great flexibility in how a country would determine how it could contribute, without adding any additional assessment process or burden. Any process under this new agreement can be focused on only how parties are doing at the national level and what they need to do to move forward. It agreed with AILAC on the need to strengthen existing institutional arrangements.

Ecuador asked what use would be the 2015 agreement if we only reiterate to take into account in national planning. Cancun Adaptation Framework recognizes the provision of new, scaled up, adequate, and predictable finance.

The **United Arab Emirates** said that adaptation was a critical issue and a balanced approach was needed. In the discussion on a global goal this has to be framed in the right language, setting a goal that is achievable for everybody and enhances adaptation internationally. Adaptation will be different in different countries and the language needs to reflect that. It said the agreement needs to highlight adaptation as a common issue. There must be some formal process for recognition of states' adaptation efforts, and collective efforts through regional or other partnerships. There is a need to strengthen institutions and increase important linkages within the UNFCCC with finance and means of implementation. There should be a clear demonstration of the provision of finance.

Tuvalu said it was important to incorporate existing institutions within new agreement. There was a need for assurance that these institutions will stay. For example, every two years we have to justify the LEG. It said the institutions should be in the agreement, with a linkage mechanism, to find coherence in their work. A review mechanism is also needed in the agreement, to see whether the finance is matching adaptation needs. The review mechanism should be linked by timing with the IPCC. What science tells us should be fed into the review mechanism. It said in referring to the elements of the convention, Article 4.9 should also be mentioned. In the list of actions there should be an element on some sort of process that people who are internally and externally displaced would be afforded appropriate human rights and opportunities. On INDCs it said that while some advanced economies can produce the information needed, LDCs would not be able to do this and it is an unfair process. Other mechanisms should be looked at for reporting, such as a registry, but not pre-2020.

It raised concern over two words that were being used. One was "mainstreaming." While it recognized that policy coherence is important, it pointed out that the most effective adaptation work is done by local communities, which are not part of policy coherence. It did not want to create conditionality on that work. The other

word of concern was “streamlining,” which is often a euphemism for cut-backs, or adaptation-lite. It said we did not want adaptation-lite in the agreement.

Cuba said any element addressed here had to be in the context of the principles and commitments of the Convention. **Ethiopia** said there could not be common methodologies for adaptation assessment.

Mexico did not know whether an overarching goal was feasible. In terms of institutional arrangements, it proposed an adaptation mechanism. It would bring in adaptation bodies already existing, such as the Nairobi Work Programme, and proposed that the work could be downscaled – brought down to national and local levels, in order to develop and strengthen local and social capability. It noted that there was a breadth of methodologies, but the challenge before us was to ensure that these methods were available at these levels. It also proposed the idea of a registry and the establishment of knowledge platforms, with a results-oriented approach.

The **Republic of Korea** said there was a need for streamlining activities of existing arrangements. It said a registry would contribute to enhancing adaptation actions.

Norway said that adaptation should be part of a new agreement. On the issue of commitments, it said the NAPs reference is a good one, and that there was a need to try to narrow down what is a NAP, possibly with a workshop under the ADP. It said there was a need to be careful to avoid new and additional reporting requirements, and rather to adjust mechanisms already there. On institutions, it said there was not a need for new ones, but a need to develop knowledge sharing. It was in support of a stronger structure for regional support and organizations. On finance it said there was a need to provide support for means of implementation for adaptation for developing countries and referenced the GCF 50% allocation to adaptation.

Switzerland made reference to the general framework of the agreement, noting that adaptation should be a part of it. It added that not all adaptation actions would depend on support. It said it is beneficial to have a specific goal, but said commitment is not a goal but what you do to achieve a goal. It said the goal is to increase resilience and adaptive capacity, and saw benefit to have this goal in an agreement. It

agreed that the 2015 could include NAPS and mention of national development strategies but cautioned against a seduction to do something prescriptive. It said there was a need to reflect specific circumstances, as for example, it did not make sense for Switzerland to develop a strategy on sea level rise. It said new institutions were not necessary but that the COP could build on existing institutions through a COP decision. It added there was no need for new reporting requirements beyond national communications.

New Zealand said there is no need for new institutions, but a need to streamline adaptation components to deliver on collective aspects, looking for gaps and duplications. It said all the bullets on the screen were part of the Adaptation Committee work and best done in subsidiary bodies. The agreement should encourage all Parties to take on adaptation. The Paris (2015) outcome must give an aspirational goal and provide a consolidated framework to support domestic decision-making.

The **European Union** said the core objective should be promoting collective action and climate resilience and sustainable development, to give a boost to the way in which the current regime and institutions are treating this issue of adaptation. Missing in the bullet points are the collective commitments in the Convention, to address transboundary issues such as those raised by Bangladesh. There needed to be a collective commitment and a collective goal. It said that the implications of INDCs for mitigation were clear, but they did not know what it would look like for adaptation. It said it shared the concerns of Bhutan, that this would be an additional burden on top of NAPs. It agreed with Bangladesh on the differences between adaptation and mitigation and that the processes to negotiate these elements need to be kept separate. It said it agreed with Brazil on the showcasing of needs of developing countries, and added that national communications and NAPs help countries to showcase their actions and where they need assistance. There were ways of strengthening these existing means.

Japan said that adaptation was a global challenge, but difficult to measure, and wondered if a global goal was achievable or doable. It said all Parties should be encouraged to integrate adaptation into national planning and according to national circumstances. It supported strengthening existing institutions but did not

support the creation of new ones. It expressed concerns about having common methodologies, saying that it was an ambitious idea, and even in Japan agencies have difficulties to have common methodologies.

Australia said that adaptation should be an important part of an agreement, but the challenge was how to reflect adaptation with localized impacts. It shared the view that adaptation should be the responsibility of all countries, to plan and implement adaptation in accordance with national priorities. Adaptation should be addressed through some form of country-driven process. The COP should decide implementation modalities, using existing institutional arrangements. This is what would be achievable by Paris. Looking into the future there could be development of an information sharing process around responses to ensure efforts are recognized. There could be further attention to adaptation action, with priorities determined after Paris.

The **United States** said adaptation was an essential part of the work and the agreement, and that it was important to elevate the profile of adaptation also at national and subnational levels. There could be a reaffirmation of the commitment to undertaking adaptation and strengthening the language of the importance of Parties to undertaking national adaptation planning processes. It said there is great value in

calling on Parties to integrate adaptation into way they do development, in national planning and development processes. It should not only be the environment ministry doing this work, but other ministries too, as well as subnational entities. It said there were already institutions under the convention focused on adaptation, including the Climate Technology Centre and Network, which has already received four requests on adaptation. We should figure out ways for an agreement to enhance global cooperation and coordination, and provide strengthening tools for Parties to assess their risks. On the long-term goal it said that a qualitative goal might be the most workable.

Canada said it is not sure that common methodologies would be appropriate in an assessment framework. It said the notion of a registry is worth looking at. Adaptation action should be based on the best available science and knowledge, building on lessons learned and existing policies and programmes. It said it is not adverse to the notion of a long-term goal, but has concerns as to how it is framed. The time frame under which ecosystems adapt will vary at national and subnational levels and is very much a national consideration.

Iceland agreed with Mexico on integrating gender equality into the new agreement and cautioned not to victimize women or categorize as a minority group.