

Filling the frame in the Adaptation Framework

Slowly, Parties have been filling in the frame in the Contact Group on Adaptation. While we have heard many sound ideas, mostly from developing countries, we still see no fully developed content for this framework.

There is still a lack of clarity on what mechanisms are needed to build trust between countries. Providers want to be confident that funds will be spent in a way that delivers adaptation, and recipients want to be sure that the finance provided is sufficient, urgent, and without conditionality.

From our point of view, the Adaptation Framework needs to achieve three objectives:

1. Ensure that all Parties meet their commitments under the Convention and the Bali Action Plan, in particular the provision of finance by developed countries to support the most vulnerable countries in adapting to climate change,
2. Provide support for preparation *and implementation* of National Adaptation Strategies in developing countries, and
3. Ensure risk management and compensation through a Climate Insurance Mechanism and a Compensation and Restitution Mechanism.

Priorities for adaptation activities should involve a comprehensive vulnerability assessment based on physical, ecological, social, economic and gender-based aspects of vulnerability. We welcome that many Parties have

spoken of the need to give particular attention to most vulnerable communities, people and ecosystems.

We believe that National Adaptation Plans or Strategies prepared with the full involvement of civil society, vulnerable communities, and the private sector would be an effective way of determining adaptation priorities. These national plans would draw on existing experience and lessons learned from implementation under other UN conventions, traditional knowledge, and programmes for poverty reduction and risk mitigation.

National Strategies would be living documents, a constantly updated compilation of sub-national adaptation plans and actions under a national vision. They would include:

- Programmes to benefit from funds for technology and REDD mechanisms where they link to adaptation;
- Integration of adaptation into sectoral and national planning;
- Identification of enabling policy frameworks;
- Needs for improved information, particularly on climate;
- Needs for capacity building within all levels of society.

The proportional allocation of funding to each of these areas would be decided at a national level.

The Adaptation Window of a future funding

structure under the UNFCCC should provide at least 50 billion USD annually from public finance, delivered as grants by Annex 1 Parties in addition to their ODA commitments.

We see a strong role of the UNFCCC in supporting preparation and implementation of the NAPAs, sharing experience at community, regional and national levels, with support from existing and new institutions. Finally, there should also be an independent review panel reporting to the COP on delivery of finance for adaptation and progress in implementation.

The Bali Action Plan calls for adaptation actions “now, up to and beyond 2012”. The 40 NAPAs submitted by the LDCs which have identified “urgent and immediate” adaptation projects are *still* waiting to be fully funded from the less than \$200m now available in the LDC Fund. The Copenhagen Agreement *must* include new pledges by developed countries to deliver at least \$2 billion from Annex 1 Parties for the LDC Fund to fulfill this eight-year-old promise.

Adaptation post-2012 must not be about incremental expansion of existing activities if we want to safeguard the lives and livelihoods of billions of people and the ecosystems on which we all depend. We need a fundamental change in the level and nature of support for developing countries, and Annex 1 Parties need to step up and scale up the financial resources and the new and enhanced mechanisms and institutions that will be needed to make it happen.

Dear EU – Please Clarify...

There was a great deal of feel-good factor created today at the AWG-LCA with the EU supporting the G77 and China proposal and also committing to consider the Indian proposal for establishment of regional and international centres of innovation and networking. Such incubation centres will address issues of accessibility, affordability of technology products, the best-laid provisions of implementation and modification, and the predictability of funds required for development, deployment and diffusion of funds and overall the barriers related to the IPRs.

While the EU supported such an idea during the intervention, a big gap remains between ‘cup and lip.’ Thus we seek the following clarifications on its interventions:–

The EU committed to doubling its cur-

rent level of R&D expenditure by 2012 and quadrupling it by 2020. This investment in technology development would be done inside their own geographical boundaries, and the question of diffusion and sharing with the have-nots is yet to be addressed.

Further, towards the end of their intervention, the EU talked about the removal of barriers. But they never explained what kind of barriers they were talking about. ECO would like to remind the EU that developing countries asked specifically for the removal of IPR barriers... and not just lip service.

The EU needs to elaborate on its genuine intentions to ensure appropriate barriers are removed and a global technology and finance regime is ensured on the basis of Convention principles.

–*Magic to Miracles, from front page* to obscure the atmospheric truth, rather than provide transparency. Furthermore, if the “bar” concept moves forward, ECO wonders where Russia would like to negotiate its bar and on which side of the bar such miracles will lie.

In 1909, one hundred years before Copenhagen, Harry Houdini published *Hand-*

cuff Secrets, in which he revealed how his miraculous escapes actually worked. ECO hopes Parties will fully explain their proposals in contact groups and submissions, revealing how future accounting systems for LULUCF would actually work. This will take away the magic, but with the climate at stake, we can’t afford to rely on more miracles.

LUDWIG

What a to-do over G77 nominations for AWGKP chair! AOSIS wishes to propose a well-known Caribbean gentleman, and the African rival camp goes so far as to get a legal ruling that AOSIS doesn’t exist. Ludwig would like to remind them that, if we believe these negotiations will be successful, we should all be wishing AOSIS a long and fruitful existence.

On the subject of chairs, Ludwig hears that the distinguished LCA chair commented yesterday that, while there is a ‘Fossil of the Day’ for nefarious deeds, there is no counterbalancing “Man of the Match” award. Ludwig suggests MZC might reflect on his long experience with these negotiations, consider where things stand, and compare them to where they should be in the light of current science. He might then understand why there are no awards for heroism just yet.

Finally, Ludwig was a little dozy in yesterday morning’s mitigation group, but shortly after AOSIS’s promotion of a 45% reduction target for Annex I, did he hear a Saudi call for “no more than 40%”? If so, is there now a Saudi 40% threshold below which no self-respecting progressive Party would dare to go?