

## Summary of the Sharm El-Sheikh Climate Change Conference: 6–20 November 2022

Delegates gathered against an ominous backdrop of multiple crises: energy, cost of living, indebtedness, nature loss, and geopolitical tensions among major powers. But the need to act in the face of the climate crisis has never been clearer. Global average temperature rise is already 1.1°C. People around the world are experiencing the effects of climate change, from heatwaves and droughts to floods and superstorms. Only the wealthiest countries can (so far) cope. As Sherry Rehman, Minister of Climate Change, Pakistan, implored “Vulnerability shouldn’t be a death sentence.”

The need to protect the most vulnerable led to a historic decision at the Sharm El-Sheikh Climate Change Conference, after a hard political bargain was struck across significant areas of climate action. For the first time, countries agreed to recognize the need for finance to respond to loss and damage associated with the adverse effects of climate change, and quickly established a fund and the necessary funding arrangements, with the details to be worked out over the coming year.

Other key elements of this package were the work programmes on urgently scaling up mitigation ambition and the Global Goal on Adaptation (GGA). On mitigation, developed and climate-vulnerable countries pushed for a strong outcome to ramp up efforts to reduce emissions before 2030, calling this “the critical decade.” In the end, countries agreed to a process that will explore topics, which are to be decided, and identify opportunities and gaps to reduce emissions. Several countries expressed some worry that the mitigation outcome may not be enough to “keep 1.5°C alive.”

On the GGA, countries were more pleased with the outcome. Parties agreed to a long-term, structured effort that will help countries to collectively achieve the global adaptation goal. This framework will also review progress towards its achievement. Given the context-specific nature of adaptation, that countries will have to adapt to different climate impacts, this framework will generate information that can help to enable and capture progress. It will be reviewed before the second Global Stocktake in 2028.

Parties also adopted two overarching cover decisions, together called the Sharm El-Sheikh Implementation Plan. Both decisions address science, energy, mitigation, adaptation, loss and damage, finance, and pathways to a just transition. Some highlights include:

- retaining the call to phase down unabated coal power and phase out inefficient fossil fuel subsidies, as adopted in the 2021 Glasgow Climate Pact (Decisions 1/CP26 and 1/CMA.3);

- urging parties that have not yet communicated new or updated nationally determined contributions (NDCs) or long-term low greenhouse gas (GHG) development strategies to do so by the next meeting;
- establishing a work programme on just transition to discuss pathways to achieve the goals of the Paris Agreement;
- launching the Sharm El-Sheikh dialogue to enhance understanding of the scope of Article 2.1(c) of the Paris Agreement (ensuring finance flows are consistent with low-GHG, climate-resilient development), and its complementarity with Article 9 of the Paris Agreement (climate finance);
- urging developed countries to provide enhanced support to assist developing countries to both mitigate and adapt, and encouraging other parties to provide or continue to provide such support voluntarily; and

### In this Issue

A Brief History of the UNFCCC, the Kyoto Protocol, and the Paris Agreement . . . . .	2
Report of the Conference . . . . .	3
Opening Statements . . . . .	3
Sharm El-Sheikh Climate Implementation Summit . . . . .	3
Sharm El-Sheikh Implementation Plan . . . . .	3
Conference of the Parties (COP 27) . . . . .	6
Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement (CMA 4) . . . . .	11
Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP 17) . . . . .	20
Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI 57) . . . . .	22
Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA 57) . . . . .	25
SBI/SBSTA . . . . .	27
Closing Plenary . . . . .	29
A Brief Analysis of COP 27 . . . . .	30
Upcoming Meetings . . . . .	32
Glossary . . . . .	33

- calling for multilateral development bank reform, including in their practices and priorities and to define a new vision, operational models, channels, and instruments that are fit for adequately addressing the global climate emergency.

Other key outcomes from the meeting include:

- progress towards operationalizing the Santiago Network on loss and damage through adopting its terms of reference, agreeing on its structure, and launching the selection process for its host Secretariat;
- providing operational guidance for scaling up cooperative approaches under Paris Agreement Article 6.2;
- enabling the full operationalization of the Article 6.4 market mechanism;
- specifying modalities for the work programme under the Article 6.8 framework for non-market approaches; and
- continuing the technical dialogue under the Global Stocktake.

The meeting also featured the Sharm El-Sheikh Implementation Summit, where over 100 Heads of State and Government attended. By the end of the meeting, which concluded on 20 November, more than 39 hours after the scheduled close, parties had adopted 60 decisions.

The Sharm El-Sheikh Climate Change Conference convened in Egypt from 6-20 November 2022. The Conference included the:

- 27th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (COP 27);
- 4th meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement (CMA 4);
- 17th meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP 17);
- 57th meeting of the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI 57); and
- 57th meeting of the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA 57)

In total, 33,449 people attended, including 16,118 delegates from parties, 13,981 observers, and 3,350 members of the media.

### A Brief History of the UNFCCC, the Kyoto Protocol, and the Paris Agreement

The international political response to climate change began with the 1992 adoption of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), which sets out the basic legal framework and principles for international climate change cooperation with the aim of stabilizing atmospheric concentrations of GHGs to avoid “dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system.” The Convention, which entered into force on 21 March 1994, has 198 parties.

To boost the effectiveness of the UNFCCC, the Kyoto Protocol was adopted in December 1997. It commits industrialized countries and countries in transition to a market economy to achieve quantified emissions reduction targets for a basket of six GHGs. The Kyoto Protocol entered into force on 16 February 2005 and has 192 parties. Its first commitment period took place from 2008 to 2012. The 2012 Doha Amendment established the second commitment period from 2013 to 2020. To date, 148 parties have ratified the Doha Amendment.

In December 2015, parties adopted the Paris Agreement. Under the terms of the Agreement, all countries will submit NDCs and review the aggregate progress on mitigation, adaptation, and means

of implementation every five years through a Global Stocktake (GST). The Paris Agreement entered into force on 4 November 2016, and has 194 parties.

### Recent Key Turning Points

**Paris:** The 2015 UN Climate Change Conference convened in Paris, France, culminating with the adoption of the Paris Agreement on 12 December. The Agreement includes the goal of limiting the global average temperature increase to well below 2°C above pre-industrial levels, and pursuing efforts to limit it to 1.5°C. It also aims to increase parties’ ability to adapt to the adverse impacts of climate change and make financial flows consistent with a pathway towards low-GHG emissions and climate-resilient development. The Agreement should be implemented to reflect equity and the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities, in light of different national circumstances.

Under the Paris Agreement, each party shall communicate, at five-year intervals, successively more ambitious NDCs. Under the common time frames decision adopted in 2021 in Glasgow, each NDC will last ten years, but will still be updated every five years. The Paris Agreement also includes a transparency framework and a process known as the GST. Beginning in 2023, parties will convene this process at five-year intervals to review collective progress on mitigation, adaptation, and means of implementation. The Agreement also includes provisions on adaptation, finance, technology, loss and damage, and compliance.

When adopting the Paris Agreement, parties launched the Paris Agreement Work Programme (PAWP) to develop the Agreement’s operational details. Parties also agreed on the need to mobilize stronger and more ambitious climate action by all parties and non-party stakeholders to achieve the Paris Agreement’s goals. Several non-party stakeholders made unilateral mitigation pledges in Paris, with more than 10,000 registered actions.

**Marrakech:** The UN Climate Change Conference in Marrakech took place from 7-18 November 2016 and included the first meeting of the CMA. Parties adopted several decisions related to the PAWP, including: work should conclude by 2018; the terms of reference for the Paris Committee on Capacity-building; and initiating a process to identify the information to be provided in accordance with Paris Agreement Article 9.5 (*ex ante* biennial finance communications by developed countries). Other decisions included approving the five-year workplan of the Warsaw International Mechanism for Loss and Damage associated with Climate Change Impacts (WIM), enhancing the Technology Mechanism, and continuing and enhancing the Lima work programme on gender.

**Fiji/Bonn:** The Fiji/Bonn Climate Change Conference convened from 6-17 November 2017 in Bonn, Germany, under the COP Presidency of Fiji. The COP launched the Talanoa Dialogue, a facilitative dialogue to take stock of collective progress towards the Paris Agreement’s long-term goals. The COP also established the “Fiji Momentum for Implementation,” a decision giving prominence to pre-2020 implementation and ambition. Parties also provided guidance on the completion of the PAWP and decided that the Adaptation Fund shall serve the Paris Agreement, subject to decisions to be taken by CMA 1-3. Parties also further developed, or gave guidance to, the Local Communities and Indigenous Peoples Platform, the WIM Executive Committee (ExCom), the Standing Committee on Finance, and the Adaptation Fund.

**Katowice:** The Katowice Climate Change Conference convened from 2-14 December 2018 in Katowice, Poland, concluding a busy year that featured an additional negotiation session to advance work on the PAWP. Parties adopted the Katowice Climate Package, which finalized nearly all of the PAWP, including decisions to facilitate common interpretation and implementation of the Paris Agreement on the mitigation section of NDCs, adaptation communications, transparency framework, GST, and financial transparency, among others. Work on cooperative implementation, under Article 6 of the Agreement, was not concluded, and parties agreed to conclude this work in 2019. The COP was unable to agree on whether to “welcome” or “note” the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change’s (IPCC) Special Report on 1.5°C of Global Warming.

**Chile/Madrid:** The Chile/Madrid Climate Change Conference convened from 2-17 December 2019 in Madrid, under the COP Presidency of Chile. Decisions were adopted on the review of the WIM and some finance-related issues, such as guidance to the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and Green Climate Fund (GCF). Parties also adopted the Chile/Madrid Time for Action. On many other issues, notably Article 6 and long-term finance, countries could not reach an agreement.

**Intersessional Meetings:** The COVID-19 pandemic disrupted the normal meeting cycle in 2020. Online sessions were held in June and November 2020 to hear updates from the constituted bodies and hold mandated events. The Climate Ambition Summit in December 2020 served as a platform for countries to put forward new NDCs and net zero pledges. In June 2021, the Subsidiary Bodies met online for informal consultations. No decisions were taken during this period due to concerns about inclusivity. Views were captured in informal notes prepared by the Chairs.

**Glasgow:** The Glasgow Climate Change Conference convened from 31 October – 12 November 2021 and marked the return to formal negotiations after the COVID-19 pandemic-related interruption. Parties finalized the Paris Agreement rulebook, adopting guidelines, rules, and a work programme on Article 6, and agreeing on the format of reporting under the enhanced transparency framework. Parties adopted the Glasgow Climate Pact, a series of three overarching cover decisions which, for the first time, included a reference to phasing down unabated coal power and phasing out inefficient fossil fuel subsidies. They also agreed to work programmes on a global goal for adaptation, and on urgently scaling up mitigation; created the Glasgow Dialogue on loss and damage; established a process towards defining a new collective quantified goal on climate finance; and launched an annual dialogue on ocean-based climate action.

### Report of the Conference

The Sharm El-Sheikh Climate Change Conference opened on Sunday, [6 November](#), with an opening ceremony featuring statements by COP 26 President Alok Sharma (UK), COP 27 President Sameh Shoukry (Egypt), UNFCCC Executive Secretary Simon Stiell, and IPCC Chair Hoesung Lee. Together, they stressed the need to move from negotiations and pledges to ambitious implementation.

### Opening Statements

Following the opening ceremony on [6 November](#), delegations and stakeholder groups presented their opening statements, outlining expectations for the Sharm El-Sheikh Climate Change Conference.

### Sharm El-Sheikh Climate Implementation Summit

On [7](#) and [8](#) November, over 100 heads of state gathered to give speeches and engage in roundtable discussions. The six roundtables addressed food security, innovative finance, just transition, investing in the future of energy: green hydrogen, climate change and the sustainability of vulnerable communities and water security.

### Sharm El-Sheikh Implementation Plan

The Sharm El-Sheikh Implementation Plan is a set of two overarching cover decisions. These decisions are not associated with a specific agenda item and therefore do not have a specific mandate, unlike most decisions. They are open-ended and, in recent years, have been used to capture the progress made in the negotiations and various events held adjacent to the negotiations, such as the Marrakesh Partnership for Global Climate Action. The decisions also have launched new work programmes and set out new intentions among parties. For example, the Glasgow Climate Pact in 2021 included a call for developed countries to double adaptation finance provided, compared to 2019 levels.

Negotiations for these overarching cover decisions took place in Heads of Delegation meetings on [15](#), [17](#), 18, and 19 November, facilitated by Wael Aboulmagd, Special Representative of the COP 27 President.

On 18 November, in a consultation open to observers, Aboulmagd explained that the Presidency had issued a first draft based on feedback on a non-paper distributed the previous day.

Many parties welcomed the draft as an improvement on the non-paper and a move in the right direction, and some said they would submit written amendments. Most urged greater ambition in the text while identifying a range of different issues and means to achieve this.

Bangladesh, for the LEAST DEVELOPED COUNTRIES (LDCs), said the cover decisions must focus on stepped-up, scaled-up implementation, as well as robust accountability mechanisms for the commitments already made. Brazil, for ARGENTINA, BRAZIL AND URUGUAY, proposed strengthening references to resilience, energy access, equity and common but differentiated responsibilities (CBDR), timely funding, and more comprehensive text on forests.

Many speakers addressed the issue of financing. Pakistan, for the GROUP OF 77 and CHINA (G-77/CHINA), proposed stronger text on, *inter alia*, technology, finance, resilience, energy access, and capacity building. He said the text on finance is “too weak on ambition and too strong on statistics.” The US pointed out that the donor base is not restricted to developed countries and questioned data in the finance section.

There were many calls for reforming multilateral development banks (MDBs). Zambia, for the AFRICAN GROUP, Chile, for the INDEPENDENT ALLIANCE OF LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN (AILAC), and Antigua and Barbuda, for the ALLIANCE OF SMALL ISLAND STATES (AOSIS) urged reform to make them “fit for purpose.” Developed countries concurred that MDBs must align their activities with the Paris Agreement goals. Bolivia, for the LIKE-MINDED GROUP OF DEVELOPING COUNTRIES (LMDCs) queried the inclusion of MDB language, suggesting that developed countries should not shift their responsibilities to provide support.

Mitigation was highlighted by many speakers, especially developed country parties. AUSTRALIA called for all countries to urgently raise their efforts in the pre-2030 period. Switzerland, for

the ENVIRONMENTAL INTEGRITY GROUP (EIG), NORWAY, and the EUROPEAN UNION (EU) said it should build on Glasgow's work on, among others, coal and, with CANADA, fossil fuel subsidies. The EU, UK, and AOSIS sought text on peaking emissions before 2025.

CHINA said it is developed countries, not developing countries, that are backsliding on commitments. INDIA said the Glasgow Climate Pact should not have the same status as the UNFCCC and the Paris Agreement. Saudi Arabia, for the ARAB GROUP, said renewable energy references should be complemented by abatement and removal technologies, and the focus should be on emissions. The US did not support a work programme on just transition.

There were many calls to include a recognition of human rights, including the right to a healthy environment.

On 19 November, Aboulmagd asked parties for views on the Presidency's proposal. Some developing countries expressed comfort with the text, with minor changes. Many countries, developed and developing, sought further changes, additions, or deletions.

During its closing plenary, on 20 November, the COP adopted the decision.

**COP Decision:** The "Sharm El-Sheikh Implementation Plan" (FCCC/CP/2022/L.19) includes 16 sections on a wide range of areas of climate action. The COP, *inter alia*:

- acknowledges parties should, when taking action to address climate change, *inter alia*, respect, promote and consider their respective obligations on human rights, the right to a clean, healthy and sustainable environment, the right to health, and the rights of Indigenous Peoples;
- underlines the urgent need to address the interlinked global crises of climate change and biodiversity loss comprehensively and synergistically; and
- acknowledges that climate change exacerbates the global energy and food crises, and vice versa, particularly in developing countries; and stresses that the increasingly challenging global geopolitical situation and its impact on the energy, food and economic situations, and the additional challenges from the COVID-19 pandemic should not be used as a pretext for backtracking, backsliding or de-prioritizing climate action.

On **science and urgency**, the COP, *inter alia*: reiterates that climate change impacts will be much lower at the temperature increase of 1.5°C compared with 2°C and resolves to pursue further efforts to limit the temperature increase to 1.5°C; and recognizes the impact of climate change on the cryosphere and the need for further understanding of these impacts, including of tipping points.

On **enhancing ambition and implementation**, the COP, *inter alia*, resolves to implement ambitious, just, equitable and inclusive transitions to low-emission and climate-resilient development in line with the principles and objectives of the Convention, the Kyoto Protocol, and the Paris Agreement, taking into account relevant decisions.

On **energy**, the COP:

- emphasizes the urgent need for immediate, deep and sustained reductions in global GHG emissions by parties across all applicable sectors, including through an increase in low-emission and renewable energy, just energy transition partnerships, and other cooperative actions;
- recognizes the unprecedented global energy crisis underlines the urgency to rapidly transform energy systems to be more secure,

reliable, and resilient, including by accelerating clean and just transitions to renewable energy during this critical decade of action; and

- stresses the importance of enhancing a clean energy mix at all levels as part of diversifying energy mixes and systems, in line with national circumstances and recognizing the need for support towards just transitions.

On **mitigation**, the COP, *inter alia*:

- recognizes limiting global warming to 1.5°C requires rapid, deep, and sustained reductions in global GHG emissions of 43% by 2030 relative to the 2019 level;
- calls upon parties to accelerate the development, deployment, and dissemination of technologies, and the adoption of policies, to transition towards low-emission energy systems, including by rapidly scaling up the deployment of clean power generation and energy efficiency measures, including accelerating efforts towards the phasedown of unabated coal power and the phase-out of inefficient fossil fuel subsidies, while providing targeted support to the poorest and most vulnerable in line with national circumstances and recognizing the need for support towards a just transition;
- reiterates its invitation to parties to consider further actions to reduce by 2030 non-carbon dioxide GHG emissions, including methane;
- emphasizes the importance of protecting, conserving, and restoring nature and ecosystems to achieve the Paris Agreement temperature goal, including through forests and other ecosystems acting as GHG sinks and reservoirs and by protecting biodiversity, while ensuring social and environmental safeguards; and
- recognizes the importance of maximizing the positive and minimizing the negative economic and social impacts of the implementation of response measures.

On **adaptation**, the COP, *inter alia*:

- notes with serious concern the existing gap between current levels of adaptation and levels needed to respond to adverse climate change effects in line with findings from the contribution of Working Group II to the IPCC's Sixth Assessment Report;
- urges parties to adopt a transformational approach to enhancing adaptive capacity, strengthening resilience, and reducing vulnerability to climate change; and
- urges developed country parties to urgently and significantly scale up their provision of climate finance, technology transfer and capacity building for adaptation so as to respond to the needs of developing country parties as part of a global effort, including for the formulation and implementation of national adaptation plans (NAPs) and adaptation communications.

On **loss and damage**, the COP, *inter alia*:

- notes with grave concern the growing gravity, scope and frequency in all regions of loss and damage associated with the adverse effects of climate change, resulting in devastating economic and non-economic losses, including forced displacement and impacts on cultural heritage, human mobility, and the lives and livelihoods of local communities, and underlines the importance of an adequate and effective response to loss and damage;
- expresses deep concern regarding the significant financial costs associated with loss and damage for developing countries,

resulting in a growing debt burden and impairing the realization of the Sustainable Development Goals; and

- welcomes the consideration, for the first time, of matters relating to funding arrangements responding to loss and damage associated with the adverse effects of climate change, including a focus on addressing loss and damage, under the COP and CMA.

On **early warning and systematic observation**, the COP, *inter alia*: emphasizes the need to address existing gaps in the global climate observing system, particularly in developing countries; and invites development partners, international financial institutions and the operating entities of the Financial Mechanism to provide support for implementation of the Early Warnings for All initiative.

On **implementation and pathways to just transition**, the COP, *inter alia*: affirms that sustainable and just solutions to the climate crisis must be founded on meaningful and effective social dialogue and participation of all stakeholders; and emphasizes that a just and equitable transition encompasses pathways that include energy, socio-economic, workforce and other dimensions, all of which must be based on nationally-defined development priorities and include social protection to mitigate potential impacts associated with the transition.

On **finance**, the COP, *inter alia*:

- highlights that delivering the needed funding will require a transformation of the financial system and its structures and processes, engaging governments, central banks, commercial banks, institutional investors and other financial actors;
- notes with concern the growing gap between the needs of developing country parties, and the support provided and mobilized for their efforts to implement their NDCs;
- expresses serious concern that the goal of developed country parties to jointly mobilize USD 100 billion per year by 2020 has not yet been met and urges developed country parties to meet the goal;
- urges developed country parties to provide enhanced support to assist developing country parties with respect to both mitigation and adaptation, in continuation of their existing obligations under the Convention, and encourages other parties to provide or continue to provide such support voluntarily;
- calls on the shareholders of MDBs and international financial institutions to reform MDB practices and priorities, align and scale up funding, ensure simplified access, and mobilize climate finance from various sources, and encourages MDBs to define a new vision and commensurate operational model, channels and instruments fit for the purpose of adequately addressing the global climate emergency, including deploying a full suite of instruments, from grants to guarantees and non-debt instruments, taking into account debt burdens, and to address risk appetite, with a view to substantially increasing climate finance;
- calls on MDBs to contribute to significantly increasing climate ambition using the breadth of their policy and financial instruments for greater results, including on private capital mobilization, and to ensure higher financial efficiency and maximize use of existing concessional and risk capital vehicles to drive innovation and accelerate impact; and
- emphasizes the ongoing challenges many developing country parties face in accessing climate finance and encourages further efforts to simplify access to such finance.

On the **ocean**, the COP, *inter alia*: decides that future ocean and climate change dialogues will, from 2023, be facilitated by two co-facilitators, selected by parties biennially, who will be responsible for deciding the topics for and conducting the dialogue and preparing an informal summary report to be presented in conjunction with the subsequent COP session.

On **enhancing implementation**, particularly action by non-party stakeholders, the COP, *inter alia*:

- encourages parties to increase the full, meaningful and equal participation of women in climate action and to ensure gender-responsive implementation and means of implementation, including by fully implementing the Lima Work Programme on Gender and its gender action plan;
- encourages parties to include children and youth in their processes for designing and implementing climate policy and action, and to consider including young representatives and negotiators into their national delegations; and
- invites the Secretariat to ensure greater accountability of voluntary initiatives through the Non-State Actor Zone for Climate Action platform.

**CMA Decision:** The CMA adopted a similar decision (FCCC/CMA/2022/L.21), with 17 sections. This summary contains some of the features that are unique to the CMA overarching cover decision.

On **science**, the CMA reaffirms the Paris Agreement temperature goal of holding the increase in the global average temperature to well below 2°C above pre-industrial levels and pursuing efforts to limit the temperature increase to 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels, recognizing that this would significantly reduce the risks and impacts of climate change.

On **mitigation**, the CMA, *inter alia*:

- urges parties that have not yet communicated new or updated NDCs to do so as soon as possible before CMA 5; and
- requests the Secretariat to prepare a synthesis report on long-term low-GHG emission development strategies for consideration at CMA 5;

On **adaptation**, the CMA, *inter alia*:

- recognizes the GGA will contribute to reducing the risk of climate change impacts in the context of the long-term temperature goal in line with different national circumstances, needs and priorities, and in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication; and
- also recognizes the centrality of the role of the Adaptation Fund in the climate finance architecture, welcomes the new pledges made at this session, urges all contributors to fulfil their pledges in a timely manner, and invites contributors to ensure the sustainability of the resources of the Fund.

On **implementation pathways to a just transition**, the CMA:

- establishes a work programme on just transition and requests the SBI and SBSTA to recommend a draft decision for consideration and adoption at CMA 5, with the work programme to be implemented in a manner that builds on and complements the relevant workstreams under the Convention and the Paris Agreement, including the work programme for urgently scaling up mitigation ambition and implementation; and
- decides to convene, as part of a work programme on just transition, an annual high-level ministerial roundtable on just transition, starting at CMA 5.

On **finance**, the CMA, *inter alia*, requests the Co-Chairs of the *ad hoc* work programme on the new collective quantified goal on climate finance (NCQG) on climate finance to include in their annual report options for accelerating the achievement of the goal of holding the increase in the global average temperature to well below 2°C above pre-industrial levels and pursuing efforts to limit the temperature to 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels.

On **transparency**, the CMA recalls that parties shall submit their first biennial transparency report and national inventory report, if submitted as a stand-alone report, at the latest by 31 December 2024 and recognizes the importance of the provision of increased support, in a timely, adequate, and predictable manner, to developing countries for implementing the enhanced transparency framework under the Paris Agreement.

### Conference of the Parties (COP 27)

**Organizational Matters: Election of the President:** On [6 November](#), Sameh Shoukry (Egypt) was elected as COP 27 President.

**Rules of procedure:** Parties agreed to apply the draft rules of procedure (FCCC/CP/1996/2), with the exception of draft rule 42 on voting.

**Adoption of the agenda:** After considerable discussion on [6 November](#), the agenda (FCCC/CP/2022/1/Add.1 and [Add.2](#)) was adopted after COP President Shoukry outlined how the various proposals for new agenda items would be addressed.

Consultations by the Presidency were unable to resolve disagreements on whether there should be new agenda items on:

- Special needs and circumstances of Africa;
- Paris Agreement Article 2.1(c) (finance flows consistent with low-greenhouse gas and climate-resilient development); and
- limiting global warming to 1.5°C.

On the governance of the WIM, the Presidency's held informal consultations on [14 November](#). Consensus was not reached. Parties agreed to defer the consideration of this matter to future sessions of the COP, and follow the "Glasgow approach," where the CMA would adopt decisions, which the COP would endorse.

**Election of officers other than the President:** Parties elected as Vice-Presidents Gao Li (China), Ephraim Mwepya Shitima (Zambia), Tina Kobilsek (Slovenia), Eneida Rabdishta (Albania), Javier Antonio Gutiérrez Ramirez (Nicaragua), and Tina Stege (Marshall Islands). COP 27 President Shoukry noted that the Bureau nomination for the Western European and Others Group remained outstanding. Harry Vreuls (Netherlands) was elected SBSTA Chair and Nabeel Munir (Pakistan) was elected SBI Chair. Rochelle Newbold (Bahamas) was elected as Rapporteur.

**Admission of observers:** The COP admitted the observers seeking accreditation (FCCC/CP/2022/7).

**Dates and venues:** Parties adopted a decision (FCCC/CP/2022/L.2), which includes a date change for COP 28, to take place from 30 November to 12 December 2023 in the United Arab Emirates.

**Credentials:** The COP adopted the credentials report (FCCC/CP/2022/9).

**Reports of the Subsidiary Bodies: SBSTA:** The COP took note of the oral report by SBSTA Chair Tosi Mpanu Mpanu and the SBSTA 56 and 57 reports (FCCC/SBSTA/2022/L.17 and [FCCC/SBSTA/2022/6](#)).

**SBI:** The COP took note of the oral report by SBI Chair Marianne Karlsen and the SBI 56 and 57 reports ([FCCC/SBI/2022/10/Add.1](#) and [FCCC/SBI/2022/L.18](#)).

**Reporting to and from Annex I Parties:** Consideration of this item was deferred to COP 28.

**Reporting to and from Non-Annex I Parties:** The COP adopted a decision on the revision of the modalities and guidelines for international consultation and analysis, which was forwarded from SBI 56 in June 2022.

**COP Decision:** In its decision (FCCC/SBI/2022/10/Add.1), the COP:

- decides that the modalities and procedures for international assessment and review shall continue to be used for conducting the technical review and multilateral assessment for Annex I parties; and
- requests the SBI to consider undertaking no later than at its first session of 2028, as appropriate, the review of the modalities and procedures for international assessment and review on the basis of experience of reporting, technical expert review, and multilateral assessment.

### Matters Relating to Adaptation: Report of the Adaptation Committee

The Adaptation Committee is the overall advisory body under the Convention for promoting the coherent implementation of enhanced action on adaptation. This sub-item considered the Committee's 2022 report ([FCCC/SB/2022/5](#), [Add.1](#) and [Add.2](#)), containing draft supplementary guidance for voluntary use by parties in communicating adaptation information and a technical paper on methodologies for assessing adaptation needs and their application and on related gaps and lessons learned.

This sub-item was first discussed in plenary on [6 November](#) and subsequently in joint SBI/SBSTA informal consultations, co-chaired by Pilar Bueno (Argentina) and Morgane Chiocchia (UK), including on [7](#), [8](#), and [12 November](#). Unable to reach an agreement, further consultations were necessary under the COP and CMA.

During informal consultations, the issue of whether to request the Committee to strengthen engagement with the IPCC proved contentious. Some developed countries considered this inappropriate, saying the Committee already engages with the IPCC, the IPCC is an independent body, and already has a full workload considering the seventh assessment report (AR7) cycle. Several developing countries disagreed, highlighting that the IPCC's engagement to date has been general and limited, whereas specific substantive engagement is needed on adaptation matters, specifically to consider the best available science. A developing country group also proposed inviting the IPCC to update its 1994 Technical Guidelines for Assessing Climate Change Impacts and Adaptations.

On [12 November](#), the Subsidiary Bodies (SBs) adopted conclusions (FCCC/SB/2022/L.13), which request the COP and CMA to further consider this matter on the basis of the draft text developed during the first week.

Further consultations were held jointly on this item and the review of the Adaptation Committee. On 20 November, the COP adopted a decision.

**COP Decision:** In its decision (FCCC/CP/2022/L.12), the COP, *inter alia*:

- welcomes the work of the Adaptation Committee in 2022 and takes note of the Committee's report, covering its work between September 2021 and September 2022, and the recommendations it contains;

- encourages the Committee to make further use of platforms for outreach, communication in languages other than English, and the organization of regional events and knowledge dialogues to improve the dissemination, understanding and use of its knowledge products by organizations and practitioners within and outside the UNFCCC process and in all geographical regions; and
- encourages parties to make available sufficient resources for the successful and timely implementation of the flexible workplan of the Adaptation Committee for 2022-2024.

**Review of the progress, effectiveness, and performance of the**

**Adaptation Committee:** This sub-item reviews the work of the Committee. The COP and CMA referred this item to the SBs for their consideration in conjunction with the Report of the Adaptation Committee. The bodies could not reach an agreement, and further informal consultations were held during the second week under the COP and CMA.

It was discussed in the SBSTA and SBI plenaries on [6 November](#) and subsequently in joint informal consultations, co-facilitated by Pilar Bueno (Argentina) and Morgane Chiocchia (UK), including on [7](#), [8](#), and [12 November](#).

During the discussions in informal consultations, parties noted the need to increase the visibility of the Committee's work, improve engagement with stakeholders and the IPCC, and enhance focus on NAPs.

Some parties called for separate decisions for each sub-item and for separate COP and CMA decisions, observing the CMA has no mandate to undertake this sub-item on the review of the Adaptation Committee.

On [12 November](#), the SBs adopted conclusions (FCCC/SB/2022/L.13), in which the bodies agreed to forward their draft decision text for the COP and CMA's consideration.

Further consultations under the COP continued in conjunction with the report of the Adaptation Committee. The decision (FCCC/CP/2022/L.12) is summarized above.

**WIM:** The report of the WIM is summarized under the SBI/SBSTA. The Santiago Network is summarized under the CMA.

**Matters Relating to Finance: Long-term climate finance:** The COP process on long-term finance aims to advance mobilization of climate resources from multiple sources, including public, private, bilateral, multilateral, and others. In 2010, the Cancun Agreements committed developing countries to a goal of USD 100 billion per year by 2020 for developing countries.

At COP 27, parties were informed by a technical report by the Standing Committee on Finance (SCF) on progress in achieving the USD 100 billion goal ([FCCC/CP/2022/INF.2](#)), and a report on the Fourth biennial high-level ministerial dialogue on climate finance held during COP 26 ([FCCC/CP/2022/2](#)), among others. Parties took up this item briefly during the opening plenary on [7 November](#), agreeing to establish a contact group. Lengthy consultations, co-facilitated by Carlos Fuller (Belize) and Gertraud Wollansky (Austria), took place throughout the two weeks. A key issue was how to reflect on the fact that the USD 100 billion goal had not been met and how to address the gap and encourage actions to support developing countries' needs.

While developing countries sought to highlight the need for urgent action and offer more prescriptive language, developed countries preferred to balance this with positive text where progress had been made, for instance with the Adaptation Fund and the eighth

replenishment of the Global Environment Facility (GEF-8). Some developing countries wanted to add language on the MDBs, in particular increasing grant funding. However, developed countries did not see this as the right forum for this discussion and, in general, preferred shorter, more streamlined text. Progress was slow. However, by 18 November, a compromise text was adopted by the COP during its closing plenary on 20 November.

**COP Decision:** The COP decision (FCCC/CP/2022/L.6), *inter alia*:

- notes with deep regret that the USD 100 billion has not been met and welcomes ongoing efforts to achieve it;
- welcomes recent pledges to the Adaptation Fund, the Special Climate Fund, and GEF-8;
- reiterates that a significant amount of adaptation finance should flow through the Financial Mechanism, Adaptation Fund, Least Developed Countries Fund, and Special Climate Change Fund;
- requests the SCF to prepare biennial reports on progress towards the USD 100 billion goal for consideration at COP 29, COP 31, and COP 33; and
- recognizes the lack of a common definition and accounting methodology with respect to assessing progress towards the goal.

**Standing Committee on Finance:** The SCF was established at COP 16 in 2010 to support the COP in its work relating to the UNFCCC's Financial Mechanism. The SCF also supports coherence and coordination in the delivery of financing, assists with measurement, reporting and verification, helps coordinate with other financial initiatives inside and outside the UNFCCC, and holds an annual forum. The SCF now also serves the Paris Agreement.

At COP 27 and CMA 4, parties considered several documents, including the:

- report of the SCF ([FCCC/CP/2022/8-FCCC/PA/CMA/2022/7](#));
- guidance to the Financial Mechanism's operating entities (GEF and GCF) ([FCCC/CP/2022/8/Add.5-FCCC/PA/CMA/2022/7/Add.5](#));
- work on definitions of climate finance ([FCCC/CP/2022/8/Add.2-FCCC/PA/CMA/2022/7/Add.2](#));
- summary of a forum on finance for nature-based solutions ([FCCC/CP/2022/8/Add.6-FCCC/PA/CMA/2022/7/Add.6](#));
- synthesis of view on implementing Paris Agreement Article 2.1(c) ([FCCC/CP/2022/8/Add.3-FCCC/PA/CMA/2022/7/Add.3](#));
- report on the mapping of availability of information relevant to Paris Agreement Article 2.1(c) (on ensuring finance flows are consistent with low-GHG and climate-resilient development), including its reference to Article 9 (on finance) ([FCCC/CP/2022/8/Add.4-FCCC/PA/CMA/2022/7/Add.4](#)); and
- recommendations of the Fifth Biennial Assessment and Overview of Climate Finance Flows ([FCCC/CP/2022/8/Add.1-FCCC/PA/CMA/2022/7/Add.1](#)).

On 7 November, the COP and CMA referred the SCF's work to a joint contact group co-chaired by Dominic Molloy (UK) and Janine Felson (Belize). Consultations began on 8 November and continued into the second week. Parties provided feedback on these documents and worked on several draft decisions. A main theme to emerge was a desire by many developing countries to elevate these discussions to a political level, as well as a desire for a common definition of climate finance. Developed countries generally felt the SCF's operational definitions were adequate.

Parties also proposed developing separate draft decisions for the COP and CMA on the grounds that the SCF had different mandates from each. After ongoing discussion and several lengthy meetings, the group developed four decisions, two for the COP and two for the CMA (note: for details of the CMA outcomes on the SCF, please refer to the section of this report dealing with the CMA). The COP adopted these during its closing plenary on 20 November.

**COP Decision: Second review of the SCF:** In its decision (FCCC/CP/2022/L.10), the COP adopts the terms of reference for a second review of the functions of the SCF as contained in an annex. It invites submissions on this review by 30 April 2023 and requests SBI 58 to initiate the review with a view to adopting a decision at COP 28. The annex sets out the objectives, scope, sources of information, and criteria for the second review, confirming that the goals include strengthening the SCF's work and identifying opportunities for increased efficiency and effectiveness.

**COP Decision: Matters relating to the SCF:** In its decision (FCCC/CP/2022/L.11), the COP, *inter alia*:

- notes that climate finance flows in 2019-2020 were 12% higher than in 2017-2018, averaging USD 803 billion, which includes USD 40.1 billion in public financial support from Annex I parties and USD 45.9 billion from MDBs;
- notes with concern that global finance flows are small relative to developing countries' needs;
- requests the SCF to prepare a report for COP 28 on clustering types of climate finance definitions and endorses the SCF's 2023 workplan; and
- notes with concern that draft guidance for the Financial Mechanism's operating entities was not utilized by the COP and asks the SCF to improve its working modalities.

**Report of the Green Climate Fund (GCF) and guidance to the GCF:** The GCF, which was agreed at COP16 in 2010 ([Decision 1/CP.16](#)), is one of two "operating entities" of the UNFCCC's Financial Mechanism (the other being the GEF). The GCF reports to, and is guided by, the COP. It also serves the Kyoto Protocol (through the CMP), and Paris Agreement (through the CMA).

At COP 27, the COP and CMA reviewed a note by the Secretariat on the report of the GCF ([FCCC/CP/2022/4](#) and [Add.1](#)), and a report on the operation of the nationally appropriate mitigation action (NAMA) registry ([FCCC/CP/2022/INE.1](#)).

Parties took up the matter in plenary on [6 November](#) and referred it, along with guidance to the GEF, to a contact group co-chaired by Toru Sugio (Japan) and Richard Muyungi (Tanzania). The group met several times before completing its work at the end of the second week.

Many views were expressed on the GCF, and draft decision text soon mushroomed to over 125 paragraphs. While there were various divergences, a significant dispute related to how much guidance to give the GCF. In general, developing countries wished to be more substantive and prescriptive, seeking to ensure countries had simplified access to more funds covering a wider range of activities, such as REDD+ (Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation) and loss and damage. Developed countries, meanwhile, argued that this body should provide more high-level guidance rather than "micromanage" activities, and appeared overall to be more satisfied with the existing institutional arrangements.

By Saturday, 19 November, parties were able to agree on two decisions, one under the COP and the other under the CMA. These were adopted in plenary in the early hours of Sunday, 20 November.

**COP Decision:** In its decision (FCCC/CP/2022/L.16), the COP, *inter alia*:

- welcomes the increase in the number of approved funding proposals, the increase in accredited entities, and the update of the Simplified Approval Process, among others;
- requests the GCF Board to continue to enhance support for formulating and implementing national adaptation plans, and urges it to maintain a balance between finance for adaptation and mitigation;
- invites the Board to enhance support for LDCs, small island developing states (SIDS), and other developing countries in developing project pipelines and proposals; and
- urges the Board to continue incorporating Indigenous Peoples' and local communities' interests, perspectives, knowledge and priorities in its decision making.

**Report of the GEF and guidance to the GEF:** The GEF serves as one of two "operating entities" of the UNFCCC's Financial Mechanism. The Financial Mechanism's role is to provide financial resources to developing country parties. The COP and CMA reviewed the report of the GEF ([FCCC/CP/2022/5](#) and [Add.1](#)), and a report on the operation of the NAMA registry ([FCCC/CP/2022/INE.1](#)).

Parties took up the matter in plenary on [6 November](#) and referred this matter, along with guidance to the GCF to a contact group co-chaired by Toru Sugio (Japan) and Richard Muyungi (Tanzania). The group met many times before completing its work at the end of the second week.

As with the GCF discussions, developing countries wished to provide more guidance and direction to the GEF, with many expressing disappointment that funding was still inadequate for their needs and at times hard to access, and not equitable or transparent. Developed countries, however, wished to welcome increases in funding, for instance in the GEF-8 replenishment, which they viewed positively.

Negotiations continued until the final hours of the COP, with parties finally agreeing on a shortened text on 19 November, which the COP adopted in plenary on 20 November.

**COP Decision:** In its decision (FCCC/CP/2022/L.13), the COP, *inter alia*,

- welcomes the GEF report to the COP, the approval of 86 projects and programmes under the GEF Trust Fund, LDC Fund, and Special Climate Change Fund, and the conclusion of the eighth GEF replenishment with USD 5.33 billion, an increase of 6%;
- welcomes the increased allocation of resources to SIDS and LDCs under the System for Transparent Allocation of Resources, calls on the GEF to enhance its support for the enhanced Lima Work Programme on Gender and its gender action plan, and urges more support for technology training and capacity building; and
- invites submissions on guidance to the GEF at least 10 weeks before COP 28.

**Seventh review of the Financial Mechanism:** The UNFCCC has two operating entities under the Financial Mechanism: the GEF and the GCF. At COP 27, parties agreed on 7 November to establish a contact group co-chaired by Ricardo Marshall (Barbados) and Kelly Sharp (Canada). The Co-Chairs reminded the group that its aim was to adopt guidelines for the seventh review of the Financial Mechanism and to launch the review. However, as at COP 26,



agreement was not reached, and parties decided in the closing plenary on 20 November to take up the matter again at COP 28.

**Matters relating to funding arrangements for loss and damage associated with the adverse effects of climate change, including a focus on addressing loss and damage:** The loss and damage caused by human-induced climate change is addressed under the UNFCCC in several ways, including through the WIM, the Santiago Network for technical assistance, the Fiji Clearinghouse for Risk Transfer, and the Glasgow Dialogue. None of these include funding arrangements.

At COP 27, an agenda item on funding for loss and damage was the subject of considerable focus and intense debate, and the need for progress on this issue became a rallying cry for many developing country leaders and delegates, as well as civil society.

A joint COP and CMA contact group was formed on [6 November](#), co-chaired by Julia Cordano (Chile) and Ursula Fuentes (Germany), and met numerous times before the issue was taken over by ministers, co-chaired by Maisa Rojas (Chile) and Jennifer Morgan (Germany), and then the COP presidency during final few days.

The main point of contention was a call for a new funding facility with dedicated resources for loss and damage. Developing countries, and especially SIDS and LDCs, urged for a firm decision and commitment at COP 27 that would establish and operationalize such a fund as soon as possible. They also sought the commitment of significant new and additional resources. While recognizing the importance of this issue, most developed countries preferred to use existing financial institutions to funnel funds, suggesting, for example, that a funding “window” might be created within the Financial Mechanism. There was also a reluctance on the part of some developed countries to accept text that admitted liability or referred to “compensation.”

With loss and damage funding rapidly becoming one of the most contentious issues at COP 27, negotiators only resolved the matter on 19 November, with the EU and other developed countries agreeing to a fund as part of a wider package of issues that also focused on mitigation and keeping the 1.5°C goal “alive.” The decision was finally adopted on Sunday morning, 20 November.

**COP/CMA Decision:** In their final decisions (FCCC/CP/2022/L.18, FCCC/PA/CMA/2022/L.20), the COP and CMA, *inter alia*:

- note the urgency of this issue, as illustrated by recent scientific reports such as those by the IPCC;
- decide to establish new funding arrangements for assisting developing countries that are particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change in responding to loss and damage, including with a focus on addressing loss and damage by providing and assisting in mobilizing new and additional resources, and that these new arrangements complement and include sources, funds, processes and initiatives under and outside the Convention and the Paris Agreement;
- decide, in the context of establishing the new funding arrangements, to establish a fund for responding to loss and damage whose mandate includes a focus on addressing loss and damage;
- establish a transitional committee on the operationalization of the new funding arrangements for responding to loss and damage and the fund, in accordance with the terms of reference contained in the annex, to make recommendations based on, *inter alia*,

elements for operationalization, for consideration and adoption by COP 28 and CMA 5 with a view to operationalizing the funding arrangements, including the fund;

- agree that the recommendations to operationalize the funding arrangements and the fund shall consider, *inter alia*, establishing institutional arrangements, modalities, structure, governance, and terms of reference; defining elements of the new funding arrangements; identifying and expanding sources of funding; and ensuring coordination and complementarity of existing funding sources; and
- decide that the transitional committee will be informed by, *inter alia*, the current landscape of institutions that are funding activities related to addressing loss and damage; gaps within the current landscape; priority gaps that should be explored; the most effective ways to address these gaps; and potential sources of funding, recognizing the need for a wide variety of sources, including innovative sources.

The decision contains an annex establishing terms of reference for the transitional committee. This includes its mandate, composition (10 members from developed countries, 14 from developing countries), and modalities of work.

**Matters Relating to Development and Transfer of Technologies: Joint report of the Technology Executive Committee and Climate Technology Centre and Network:** The COP referred this item to the Subsidiary Bodies, which concluded their work. The item is summarized under the SBI/SBSTA.

**Linkages between the Technology Mechanism and the Financial Mechanism:** The COP referred this item to the SBI, where the discussions are summarized.

**Capacity Building under the Convention:** The COP referred this item to the SBI, where the discussions are summarized.

**Matters Relating to the LDCs:** Discussions under this item related to the LDC Expert Group (LEG), which supports LDCs in a range of adaptation-related activities. Parties considered the report of the 42nd meeting of the LEG, including its annexed draft rules of procedure forwarded for possible adoption ([FCCC/SBI/2022/18](#)). The COP and CMA requested the SBI to continue its consideration of this issue.

The matter was first taken up in the SBI plenary on [6 November](#), when the LEG reported on its work. It was subsequently considered in informal consultations, co-facilitated by Bob Natifu (Uganda) and Jens Fugl (Denmark). These included consultations on [10 November](#), when discussions focused on the challenges LDCs face in accessing finance for the implementation of NAPs, and whether to request the GCF to provide support for LDCs’ NAP implementation. On the latter, several developed countries opined that such a request would be beyond the scope of the mandate under this agenda item and made a bridging proposal for the LEG to engage with the GCF with a view to addressing challenges related to access to funding for NAPs.

On [12 November](#), the SBI adopted conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2022/L.30), in which the SBI agrees that it was unable to conclude its consideration of the report of the LEG’s 42nd meeting, including the LEG’s draft rules of procedure. It agreed to recommend that the COP and CMA 4 consider this item further, taking into account the SBI’s draft text. During the second week, further consultations took place in informal informal consultations, under the COP and CMA.

On 20 November, the COP and CMA adopted a decision.

**COP/CMA Decision:** In their decision (FCCC/CP/2022/L.9, FCCC/PA/CMA/2022/L.8), the COP and CMA, *inter alia*:

- request the LEG to enhance the support provided to LDCs for aligning NAPs and NDCs, and to continue to support LDCs in integrating gender considerations into the formulation and implementation of NAPs;
- adopt the LEG rules of procedure contained in the annex to the decision;
- encourage the LEG to prioritize the implementation of the elements of its mandate in accordance with the needs of LDCs and the availability of resources; and
- invite parties and relevant organizations to continue providing resources to support implementation of the LEG work programme.

**Report of the Forum on the Impact of the Implementation of Response Measures:** The need to understand and address the impacts of mitigation actions is recognized under UNFCCC Articles 4.8 and 4.9, Kyoto Protocol Articles 2.3 and 3.14, and Article 4.15 of the Paris Agreement. A UNFCCC Forum was set up and, at COP 24, the Katowice Committee of Experts on the Impacts of the Implementation of Response Measures (KCI) was also created to support the Forum's work. At COP 25, a six-year workplan was adopted to guide the Forum and KCI ([FCCC/CP/2019/13/Add.1, Annex 2](#)).

The COP forwarded this item to the SBSTA and SBI, which took up this matter in their opening a plenaries on [6 November](#), and agreed to hold joint SBSTA/SBI informal consultations facilitated by Andrei Marcu (Papua New Guinea) and Daniel Waterschoot (EU). The group met several times from 9-17 November. Parties focused on delivering a decision reflecting how to follow up on the work of the Forum and the KCI, with disagreements surfacing on follow-up activities based on a midterm review of the workplan. In particular, there was lengthy debate on building awareness about the impacts of phasing down coal and phasing out fossil fuel subsidies. Furthermore, while developing countries sought text to extend the working time available to the KCI, developed countries resisted adding more meetings to the schedule.

Very little progress was made on the text, and in their closing plenaries on 12 November, the Subsidiary Bodies were only able to adopt brief conclusions ([FCCC/SB/2022/L.10](#)), forwarding the issue to the COP, CMP, and CMA.

Consultations resumed during the second week and then were moved to the COP Presidency. By late evening, 17 November, parties were finally able to agree on much of the outstanding text. However, language on the midterm review and recommended activities could not be finalized and parties decided to take this specific matter up again at SB 58.

On 20 November, the COP, CMA and CMP adopted a decision.

**COP/CMA/CMP Decision:** In their decision (FCCC/CP/2022/L.7, FCCC/KP/CMP/2022/L.7 and FCCC/PA/CMA/2022/L.7), the COP, CMA and CMP, *inter alia*,

- welcome the KCI's annual reports and adopts recommendations by the forum relating to activities relating to identifying lessons learned and best practices, capacity building for impact assessment, international cooperation, and tools and methodologies;
- encourage submissions on social and economic impacts of response measures by February 2023;
- invite submissions on review of the forum by April 2023;

- request the Secretariat to organize a regional workshop by SB 59; and
- note that the midterm review of the forum's workplan could not be concluded and take note of an informal note on the subject that could not be agreed by parties but should be taken up at SB 58. This informal note includes actions in response to the midterm review and includes bracketed text on, *inter alia*, carbon pricing, fossil fuel subsidies, coal power, capacity building, and a "just transition hub/platform."

**CMA Decision:** The CMA decision (FCCC/PA/CMA/2022/L.7) has one distinct paragraph that encourages parties to submit views by February 2023 and requests the Secretariat to compile and submit these views as input to the GST.

**Second Periodic Review of the Long-Term Global Goal under the Convention and of Overall Progress Towards Achieving**

**It:** This agenda item includes scientific inputs and deliberations over the long-term temperature goal of the Convention and assesses progress toward the goal. Parties considered the synthesis report by the Co-Chairs of the structured expert dialogue ([FCCC/SB/2022/3](#)). The item was first taken up by the COP on [6 November](#), and discussions took place in a contact group and later informal consultations, co-facilitated by Leon Charles (Grenada) and Andrew Ferrone (Luxembourg), which met throughout the first week, and on [15](#) and [16 November](#).

In the informal consultations, views diverged sharply on references to equity. Several developing countries supported references to the principles of the Convention and the Paris Agreement, particularly CBDR. Developed countries disagreed, saying there is not an accepted definition of equity in the Convention, and suggested instead to recognize the different circumstances and opportunities countries have to contribute to achieving the long-term global goal.

There was also debate on references to action before 2030 and enhanced efforts under the Convention and Paris Agreement. Two developing country groups rejected these suggestions on the basis of equity. Other developed and developing countries stressed the importance of action in this decade in line with science.

On [12 November](#), the SBs adopted conclusions (FCCC/SB/2022/L.18). The SB Chairs noted that parties had not agreed on an outcome and that they would bring this to the COP President's attention for his guidance on next steps. Consultations continued under the COP, in informal consultations and later under the COP Presidency, with the same divergences over equity, as well as references to future periodic reviews.

The Presidency issued a proposal on 19 November, and on 20 November the COP adopted a decision.

**COP Decision:** In the final decision (FCCC/CP/2022/L.17), the COP, *inter alia*:

- welcomes the work under the structured expert dialogue and takes note of the related synthesis report, including the 10 key messages;
- reaffirms the long-term global goal of holding the increase in global average temperature to well below 2°C above pre-industrial levels and pursuing efforts to limit the temperature increase to 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels;
- recalls the impacts of climate change will be much lower at the temperature increase of 1.5°C compared with 2°C, and acknowledges that limiting the global average temperature increase to 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels with no or limited

overshoot would avoid increasingly severe climate change impacts, stressing that the severity of impacts will be reduced with every increment of global warming avoided;

- underscores the need to pursue anticipatory, incremental, and transformative adaptation and address the factors underlying increasing vulnerability and risks, including lack of capacity to respond to climate change, and that most adaptation to date has been incremental, with little evidence of transformative adaptation, and tracking progress of adaptation planning remains difficult;
- recognizes that climate finance has increased since the first periodic review but is still inadequate to address the needs and priorities, reiterates that developed country parties provide enhanced support, including through financial resources, technology transfer and capacity building, to assist developing country parties with respect to both mitigation and adaptation, in continuation of their existing obligations under the Convention, and encourages other parties to provide or continue to provide such support voluntarily; and
- decides to consider the continuation of periodic reviews at COP 29.

**Gender and Climate Change:** This item considered the intermediate review of the gender action plan's implementation, including amendments to the activities under the gender action plan. On [6 November](#), the COP referred this item to the SBI, under which informal consultations convened, co-facilitated by Juan Carlos Monterrey Gomez (Panama) and Salka Sigurdardottir (United Kingdom). Debates centered on the need for additional resources to support developing countries to implement their gender action plans. In its closing plenary, on [12 November](#), the SBI adopted conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2022/L.32), which forwarded this item to the COP Presidency for additional consideration. Consultations on this item continued into the second week under the COP, facilitated by Hana Al Hashimi (United Arab Emirates).

On 20 November, the COP adopted a decision. Additional language on support for gender-related activities appears in the overarching COP cover decision and the decision on guidance to the GEF.

**COP Decision:** In its decision (FCCC/CP/2022/L.15), the COP, *inter alia*:

- urges parties to accelerate their efforts to advance implementation of the enhanced Lima Work Programme on Gender and its gender action plan;
- encourages parties and relevant organizations to strengthen the use of sex-disaggregated data and gender analysis in implementing climate policies, plans, strategies and action;
- invites the International Labour Organization to consider organizing a workshop or dialogue focused on the same topic;
- underscores the need to promote efforts towards gender balance and improve inclusivity in the UNFCCC process by inviting future COP Presidencies to nominate women as high-level climate champions, parties to promote greater gender balance in national delegations, and the Secretariat, relevant presiding officers, and event organizers to promote gender-balanced events;
- encourages parties and relevant public and private entities to strengthen the gender responsiveness of climate finance;

- requests the Secretariat to support the attendance of national gender and climate change focal points at relevant mandated UNFCCC meetings; and
- adopts the amendments to the gender action plan contained in the annex.

**Consideration for Proposals by Parties to Amend the Convention under Article 15:** This item was held in abeyance.

**Second Review of the Adequacy of Articles 4.2(a) and (b) of the Convention:** This item was held in abeyance.

**Administrative, Financial and Institutional Matters:** This was referred to the SBI, where the decisions are summarized.

**Conclusion of the Session:** The parties adopted the draft report (FCCC/CP/2022/L.1). The COP adopted a resolution expressing profound gratitude to the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt for hosting COP 27 in Sharm El-Sheikh, and requesting the Egyptian government to convey their gratitude to the city and people of Sharm El-Sheikh for their hospitality and warmth (FCCC/CP/2022/L.3).

### **Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement (CMA 4)**

**Organizational Matters: Adoption of the agenda:** The CMA adopted its agenda ([FCCC/PA/CMA/2022/1/Add.4](#)) during its opening plenary on [7 November](#). Presidency consultations were unable to reach agreement to add:

- an item on the seventh review of the Financial Mechanism; and
- the implementation of Decisions 1/CP.26, paragraph 11 and 1/CMA.3, paragraph 18 on scaling up adaptation finance.

**Election of additional officers:** This sub-item is summarized under the COP.

**Organization of work:** The organization of work was agreed as proposed in the opening plenary on [7 November](#), with most agenda items referred to the SBs and/or CMA contact groups.

**Credentials:** The CMA adopted the credentials report ([FCCC/PA/CMA/2022/9](#)).

**Reports of the Subsidiary Bodies: SBSTA:** The CMA took note of the oral report by SBSTA Chair Tosi Mpanu Mpanu and the SBSTA 56 and 57 reports (FCCC/SBSTA/2022/L.17 and [FCCC/SBSTA/2022/6](#)).

**SBI:** The CMA took note of the oral report by SBI Chair Marianne Karlsen and the SBI 56 and 57 reports ([FCCC/SBI/2022/10/Add.1](#) and FCCC/SBI/2022/L.18).

**Matters Relating to the Work Programme for Urgently Scaling up Mitigation Ambition and Implementation:** This agenda item was mandated by the Glasgow Climate Pact to explore ways to raise mitigation ambition before 2030. It was taken up in the CMA plenary on [6 November](#) and subsequently in informal SBI/SBSTA consultations, co-facilitated by Carlos Fuller (Belize) and Kay Harrison (New Zealand). Under the Subsidiary Bodies, there were informal consultations, on [7](#), [8](#), [9](#), and [12 November](#).

In informal consultations, there were disagreements about, among others: identifying new categories of countries; references to the Paris Agreement temperature goals; and timelines and actions until 2030. There were repeated calls to reflect and maintain the nationally determined nature of NDCs without imposing new targets or goals. Many linkages with ongoing processes, including the GST and NCQG were recognized.

On new categories of countries, some developed countries suggested “major emitters” and, with other countries “vulnerable developing countries.” Two groups of developing countries strongly opposed a reference to major emitters, suggesting they would invoke Rule 16 of the rules of procedure should this be retained in any text (forwarding the issue to the next COP). Related to this disagreement, developed countries sought to include references to the current state of emissions and which countries could contribute most to reducing emissions. Some developing countries called for referring to historical responsibility, equitable allocation of the remaining carbon budget, and that “human-induced climate change is a consequence of more than a century of net GHG emissions.”

On temperature goals, there were calls to refer to the need to stay below 1.5°C, whereas other countries wanted to refer to the full text of the temperature goals in the Paris Agreement to stay well below 2°C while pursuing efforts to limit long-term temperature rise to 1.5°C.

On time frames and actions before 2030, two developing country groups called for the work programme to conclude in 2023 to avoid duplication with the GST. Other developing countries, with developed countries, preferred continuing work until 2030, citing the need to reduce emissions during this “critical decade.” A midterm review, for 2024 or 2025, was suggested by some developing countries.

Countries expressed comfort with draft conclusions text, but not a draft CMA decision. At most, they suggested forwarding it to the CMA with a note that the SBI could not reach agreement.

During the closing plenaries of the Subsidiary Bodies, on [12 November](#), the SBI and SBSTA adopted conclusions (FCCC/SB/2022/L.14) that forward a draft decision to the CMA, noting it does not represent consensus among parties.

On [16 November](#), ministerial consultations began, co-facilitated by Barbara Creecy (South Africa) and Dan Jørgensen (Denmark). The Presidency then led further consultations.

In an update provided on [17 November](#), the Co-Facilitators highlighted that disagreements persisted on: maintaining the nationally determined nature of NDCs; timelines for the work programme to 2030; and a proposal for three decisions throughout the period, aligned with the GST cycle.

On 20 November, the CMA adopted its decision.

**CMA Decision:** In its decision (FCCC/CMA/2022/L.17), the CMA, *inter alia*:

- decides that the work programme shall be operationalized through focused exchanges of views, information and ideas, noting that the outcomes of the work programme will be non-prescriptive, non-punitive, facilitative, respectful of national sovereignty and national circumstances, take into account the nationally determined nature of NDCs and will not impose new targets or goals;
- decides that the work programme shall function in a manner that is consistent with the procedures and timelines for communication of successive NDCs established in the Paris Agreement;
- decides that the scope of the work programme should be based on broad thematic areas relevant to urgently scaling up mitigation ambition and implementation in this critical decade and include all sectors covered in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories, thematic areas in the

contribution of the IPCC Working Group III contribution to the Sixth Assessment Report, and relevant enabling conditions, technologies, just transitions and cross-cutting issues;

- decides that implementation of the work programme will start immediately after CMA 4 and continue until CMA 5, with a view to adopting a decision on the continuation of the work programme at that session;
- also decides that the work programme will be carried out under the CMA;
- requests the SBSTA and SBI Chairs to appoint, well in advance of their 58th sessions and every two years thereafter, in consultation with respective constituencies, two Co-Chairs for the work programme, one from a developed country party and one from a developing country party;
- decides at least two global dialogues shall be held each year as part of the work programme, with one to be held prior to the first regular sessions of the Subsidiary Bodies of the year, starting at their 58th sessions, and one prior to the second regular sessions of the Subsidiary Bodies of the year, starting at their 59th sessions, and that such dialogues should be conducted in hybrid format to allow both in-person and virtual participation;
- also decides that other in-person or hybrid dialogues may be held each year in conjunction with existing events, such as the regional climate weeks, at the discretion of the Co-Chairs of the work programme with a view to ensuring inclusive and balanced geographical representation at the dialogues;
- requests the Secretariat to organize, under the guidance of the Co-Chairs of the work programme, the dialogues above in such a manner as to facilitate a focused exchange of views, information and ideas, as well as the active participation of and interaction between parties and relevant non-party stakeholders;
- also requests the Secretariat to organize, under the guidance of the Co-Chairs of the work programme and with the support of the high-level champions, on the margins of the dialogues, investment-focused events, considering the cost of mitigation implementation, with a view to unlocking finance, including for just transitions, overcoming barriers to access to finance and identifying investment opportunities and actionable solutions informed by NDCs to help public and private financiers, investors and international climate finance providers direct finance flows towards supporting areas of opportunity to enhance mitigation in this critical decade;
- invites parties, observers and other non-party stakeholders to submit on 1 February 2023 and every year thereafter suggested topics in line with the scope of the work programme;
- decides that the Co-Chairs of the work programme will decide on and communicate by 1 March 2023 and every year thereafter the topics to be discussed at each dialogue in that year;
- requests the Secretariat to prepare, under the guidance of the Co-Chairs of the work programme, a report on each of the dialogues, reflecting in a comprehensive and balanced manner the discussions held and including a summary, key findings, and opportunities and barriers relevant to the topic, and to prepare an annual report comprising a compilation of the individual dialogue reports for consideration by the CMA, SBSTA, and SBI; and

- requests the SBSTA and SBI Chairs, taking into account the annual report, to consider progress, including key findings, opportunities and barriers, in implementing the work programme with a view to recommending a draft decision for consideration and adoption by the CMA at each of its sessions.

**Reporting and Review Pursuant to Article 13 of the Paris Agreement:** On [17 November](#), the CMA took note of the SBI 57 conclusions on this item (FCCC/SBI/2022/L.25).

**Provision of financial and technical support:** This item is summarized under the SBI.

**Options for conducting reviews on a voluntary basis and respective training courses needed to facilitate these reviews:** This item is summarized under the SBSTA.

**Matters Related to Adaptation: Report of the Adaptation Committee; Review of the progress, effectiveness and performance of the Adaptation Committee:** These items were considered jointly under the SBs and then jointly by the COP and CMA. Discussions are summarized under the COP. On 20 November, the CMA adopted a decision.

**CMA Decision:** In its decision (FCCC/PA/CMA/2022/L.10), the CMA, *inter alia*:

- welcomes the work of the Adaptation Committee in 2022 and takes note of the Committee's report, covering its work between September 2021 and September 2022, and recommendations;
- encourages the Committee to make further use of platforms for outreach, communication in languages other than English, and the organization of regional events and knowledge dialogues;
- requests the Adaptation Committee to further engage with the IPCC on technical and substantive work; and
- encourages parties to make available sufficient resources for the successful and timely implementation of the flexible workplan of the Adaptation Committee for 2022-2024.

**Glasgow-Sharm El-Sheikh work programme on the Global Goal on Adaptation (GlaSS):** This item focused on the GGA work programme, specifically to capture progress made throughout 2022 and provide guidance and concrete ways forward for 2023, including to consider the modalities for the four workshops to be conducted throughout 2023. On [6 November](#), the CMA asked the SBI and SBSTA to work jointly on this issue in informal consultations, co-facilitated by Kishan Kumarsingh (Trinidad and Tobago) and Mattias Frumerie (Sweden). Informal consultations convened five times the first week on [9](#), [10](#) (when consultations occurred twice), [11](#), and [12 November](#).

Some of the key issues revolved around whether to: establish a framework at CMA 4, to guide future work; and request the IPCC to develop a special report on the GGA. On the first, several developing country groups underscored the need for a substantive outcome at CMA 4, including the establishment of a framework, while developed countries opposed, noting insufficient time for consideration. On the IPCC, several developing country groups called it a priority for the IPCC to provide a special report, which many developed countries opposed due to the IPCC's heavy workload, particularly due to its seventh assessment report cycle.

On [12 November](#), the SBs adopted conclusions (FCCC/SB/2022/L.15), which agreed to forward the issue to the CMA, taking into account the Co-Facilitators' draft CMA decision, as well as parties' views, and recognizing that the draft text does not represent consensus and further work by the CMA is required.

Informal consultations continued during the second week, including on [14](#), [15](#), and [16 November](#). Aminauth Shauna (Maldives) and Teresa Ribera (Spain) co-facilitated ministerial consultations under the CMA, and the CMA Presidency led further consultations. On [17 November](#), the first version of the text was produced late in the evening, after an informal stocktaking session held by the CMA Presidency.

On 20 November, the CMA adopted a decision.

**CMA Decision:** In its decision (FCCC/PA/CMA/2022/L.16), the CMA, *inter alia*:

- initiates the development of a framework for the GGA to be undertaken through a structured approach under the GlaSS in 2023, with a view to the framework being adopted at CMA 5;
- decides that the framework will guide the achievement of the GGA and the review of overall progress in achieving it with a view to reducing the increasing adverse impacts, risks and vulnerabilities associated with climate change, and enhance adaptation action and support;
- decides that the framework, through the structured approach, may take into consideration, *inter alia*, dimensions, themes, cross-cutting considerations, and sources of information, and the framework will be reviewed prior to the second GST;
- decides to hold the first workshop in 2023 no later than in March and the fourth workshop in 2023 no later than six weeks prior to CMA 5, and that the four workshops in 2023 will all be held in person, with the option available for participants to actively take part virtually;
- requests the Secretariat to publish the single annual report on the workshops for 2023 no later than three weeks prior to CMA 5, and to include in this report an analysis of the outcomes of the workshops and to prepare, under the guidance of the SB Chairs, a summary of each workshop to be published prior to each subsequent workshop for consideration at SB 59 (November–December 2023);
- invites parties and observers to submit over the course of 2023 additional views on the workshops, and, following the final workshop, to submit their views on the outcomes of and work conducted under the GlasSS prior to CMA 5;
- invites the IPCC to consider updating its 1994 technical guidelines for assessing climate change impacts and adaptation as part of its seventh assessment cycle, as appropriate;
- invites the Adaptation Committee to continue contributing to the GlaSS in 2023, including by sharing their work related to indicators, metrics, and targets at different levels of governance, and other relevant areas;
- invites SB 58 to consider the outputs under the GlaSS in reviewing progress in achieving the GGA as part of the first GST; and
- decides that the elements that may be considered for the framework will be taken into consideration for reviewing overall progress in achieving the GGA in the context of the first GST.

**WIM: Report of the WIM Executive Committee (ExCom):** This item is summarized under the SBI/SBSTA.

**Santiago Network:** The Santiago Network was established under the WIM to catalyze the provision of technical assistance by relevant organizations, bodies, networks and experts (OBNEs) for the implementation of relevant approaches at various levels in developing countries that are particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change. This matter focused on considering the

terms of reference of the Santiago Network, and the criteria for selecting the host for its Secretariat. It was first taken up in CMA plenary on [6 November](#), and subsequently in joint SBI/SBSTA informal consultations, co-facilitated by Cornelia Jäger (Austria) and Lucas di Pietro (Argentina). Informal consultations convened on [8](#), [11](#), and [12 November](#), and extended into the second week, on [15](#) and [16 November](#).

Discussions included: whether the Network should have an Advisory Board, or simply provide advisory services, for example, by the WIM ExCom; the role of OBNEs; whether to coordinate through national loss and damage contact points, the UNFCCC national focal points, or other designated national authority; and which institutions or bodies can apply for technical assistance.

On [12 November](#), the SBs adopted conclusions (FCCC/SB/2022/L.17), which outline that the SBs were unable to conclude consideration of matters under this agenda item and agreed to recommend to the appropriate body or bodies to consider these matters at their session(s) held in November 2022 taking into account the informal note. On “appropriate body or bodies,” there was a footnote stating that this was pending the outcome of the Presidency consultations on WIM governance, and that nothing in the conclusions prejudices parties’ views or prejudged outcomes on matters related to WIM governance.

On 19 November, the COP and CMA adopted decisions.

**COP/CMA Decisions:** In its decision (FCCC/CP/2022/L.5/Rev.1 and FCCC/PA/CMA/2022/L.4, respectively), the COP endorses the CMA decision on the Santiago Network and notes that considerations related to WIM governance will continue at COP 28.

In its decision, the CMA, *inter alia*:

- decides that the Santiago Network will have the following structure, namely a hosted secretariat that will facilitate its work, to be known as the Santiago Network Secretariat, an Advisory Board to provide guidance and oversight to the Santiago Network Secretariat on the effective implementation of the functions of the network, and a network of member OBNEs covering a wide range of topics relevant to averting, minimizing, and addressing loss and damage;
- encourages others to provide support for the operation of the Santiago Network and technical assistance;
- adopts the terms of reference of the Santiago Network contained in Annex I of the decision;
- decides to establish the Advisory Board of the Santiago Network as part of the WIM, which will be under the authority and guidance of and accountable to the appropriate governing body or bodies, and have the roles and responsibilities outlined in the terms of reference, and that the Board’s members will be elected at the next session of the governing body or bodies and shall serve a term of two years, be eligible to serve a maximum of two consecutive terms of office, and remain in office until their successors are elected;
- requests the Advisory Board to develop draft rules of procedure with a view to recommending them to the governing body or bodies through the SBs for consideration and adoption at SB 61 (November 2024);
- decides that the Santiago Network Secretariat will be accountable to and operate under the guidance of the governing body or bodies through the Advisory Board and hosted by an

organization or a consortium of organizations able to provide the necessary administrative and infrastructural support for its effective functioning;

- decides that the selection process for the host of the Santiago Network Secretariat shall be launched upon the conclusion of COP 27 and CMA 4 with the aim of selecting the host by 2023;
- invites the WIM ExCom to designate four of its members, the Climate Technology Centre and Network (CTCN) Advisory Board and the Paris Committee on Capacity-building (PCCB) to designate two members each to serve as members on the evaluation panel, to consider the proposals, ensuring that there is a balanced representation of developed and developing country parties;
- requests SB 58 to recommend a draft decision with one proposal to host the Santiago Network Secretariat that best meets the criteria set out in Annex II of the decision for consideration and adoption by the governing body or bodies at their next session(s);
- invites parties to inform the Santiago Network Secretariat of their liaison to the UNFCCC Secretariat to support alignment of technical assistance through the Santiago Network with national priorities; and
- affirms that technical assistance provided through the Santiago Network in a demand-driven manner will be developed through an inclusive and country-driven process, taking into account the needs of vulnerable people, Indigenous Peoples and local communities.

**Matters Relating to Finance: Matters relating to the Standing Committee on Finance:** At CMA 4, work relating to the SCF was taken up in plenary on [6 November](#), when parties agreed to establish a joint COP/CMA contact group co-chaired by Dominic Molloy (UK) and Janine Felson (Belize). The group worked throughout the two weeks, discussing a range of topics relating to the SCF. In relation to the CMA in particular, there was discussion on how to address issues under Paris Article 2.1(c), with developing countries highlighting its connections with Article 9 (finance) and emphasizing the principle of CBDR. After much discussion, separate draft decisions emerged for the COP and CMA.

On 20 November, the CMA adopted decisions.

**Final CMA Decision: Second review of the SCF:** The CMA decision (FCCC/PA/CMA/2022/L.6) affirms the COP’s decision on this matter.

**Final CMA Decision: Matters relating to the SCF:** The CMA decision (FCCC/PA/CMA/2022/L.9) requests the SCF to continue its work on ways to achieve Article 2.1(c), and invites parties and stakeholders in the financial sector to make further submissions by 30 April 2023.

**Guidance to the GCF:** Discussions took place under a joint COP and CMA contact group which, after lengthy negotiations, concluded separate COP and CMA decisions on this matter. The discussions and related COP outcome are summarized under the COP.

**CMA Decision:** In its decision (FCCC/PA/CMA/2022/L.18), the CMA, *inter alia*:

- requests the GCF Board to increase its support to developing countries in order to promote a paradigm shift across both high-impact areas of mitigation potential and countries’ adaptation and resilience needs;
- encourages the GCF Board to continue supporting results-based payments through policy approaches and positive incentives; and

- requests the GCF Board to consider how to enhance support for “just transitions” of developing countries across economic sectors and transition to resilient economies.

**Guidance to the GEF:** Consideration of this matter took place under a joint COP/CMA contact group which, after lengthy negotiations, concluded relatively short but separate COP and CMA decisions. The discussions and respective COP decision are summarized under the COP.

**CMA Decision:** In its decision (FCCC/CMA/2022/L.11), the CMA, *inter alia*,

- encourages the GEF to further enhance its reporting on whether and how parties have used their System for Transparent Allocation of Resources country allocation for technology needs assessments and action plans;
- requests the GEF to improve working with its implementing agencies to expedite project preparation and submission processes for biennial transparency reports;
- encourages the GEF to continue efforts to provide adequate, predictable, and timely financing for these reports; and
- requests the GEF to consult with developing countries on how the support it provides for the reports could support them in implementing the Paris Agreement’s enhanced transparency framework.

**Matters relating to the Adaptation Fund:** This item was taken up by the CMA, CMP and SBI on [6 November](#). These bodies each considered different sub-items. The CMA, jointly with the CMP, considered the report of the Adaptation Fund Board. Discussions took place in informal consultations facilitated by Diann Black-Layne (Antigua and Barbuda) and Eva Schreuder (Netherlands).

On 18 November, after lengthy consultations, parties adopted three decisions. There are two decisions on the Board’s report, for the CMP and the CMA. They are almost identical, although the CMA decision contains several additional paragraphs aimed at bringing the Adaptation Fund in line with provisions of the Paris Agreement. The discussions and the respective CMP decisions are summarized under the CMP.

**CMA Decision:** The CMA decision (FCCC/PA/CMA/2022/L.5) duplicates much of the language in the CMP decision “Report of the Adaptation Fund Board.” It adds several paragraphs relevant to the Paris Agreement, including:

- requesting the Fund Board to update the CMA on activities and support to assist developing countries to the Paris Agreement;
- confirming that parties to the Paris Agreement are eligible for membership of the Board; and
- asking SBI 58 to continue consideration of matters relating to membership of the Board in view of the Fund’s transition to serve the Paris Agreement exclusively.

**New collective quantified goal on climate finance (NCQG):**

The Paris Outcome (Decision 1/CP.21), paragraph 53 states that an NCQG shall be set prior to the CMA’s 2025 meeting, from a floor of USD 100 billion per year. Subsequently, parties decided (Decision 9/CMA.3) that their work will be organized around an *ad hoc* work programme (including technical expert dialogues), submissions, ministerial dialogues, and CMA stocktakes and guidance.

At CMA 4, parties considered input from various documents, including the:

- report on the 2022 ministerial dialogue ([FCCC/PA/CMA/2022/INF.1](#));

- report and addendum by the Co-Chairs of the *ad hoc* work programme ([FCCC/PA/CMA/2022/5](#) and [FCCC/PA/CMA/2022/5/Add.1](#)); and
- technical paper by the Secretariat ([FCCC/TP/2022/2](#)),

This item was first taken up by the CMA on [6 November](#), where informal consultations were established, and also in a high-level ministerial dialogue on [9 November](#). Informal consultations convened on [8](#), [10](#), [13](#), [14](#), [15](#), which were co-facilitated by Zaheer Fakir (South Africa) and Georg Børsting (Norway). There was discussion on upcoming technical expert dialogues (TEDs), including future topics. Several developing country groups stressed the need for a structured workplan rather than dialogues.

There was also discussion on the level of the new goal, with developing countries seeking to reference the need for trillions rather than billions of dollars, while developed countries said it was premature to consider a “quantum,” or numerical financial goal.

There were considerable debates on the sources of support. Developed countries, opposed by some developing countries, stressed there is a role for the private sector and an expanded group of donor countries.

During the second week, Bhupender Yadav (India) and Chris Bowen (Australia) co-facilitated ministerial consultations, and provided an update on [14 November](#). The text grew as parties, particularly developing countries, sought to include ideas that were priorities for them, while developed countries generally sought text that focused more on short-term steps for 2023, rather than the final outcome in two years’ time.

**CMA Decision:** In its decision (FCCC/PA/CMA/2022/L.19), the CMA, *inter alia*:

- reiterates that the NCQG aims at contributing to accelerating the achievement of holding the increase in the global average temperature to well below 2°C above pre-industrial levels and pursuing efforts to limit the temperature increase to 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels, recognizing this would significantly reduce the risks and impacts of climate change; increasing the ability to adapt to the adverse impacts of climate change and foster climate resilience and low-GHG emissions development in a manner that does not threaten food production; and making finance flows consistent with a pathway towards low-GHG emissions and climate-resilient development;
- acknowledges the need to significantly strengthen the *ad hoc* work programme on the NCQG in light of the urgency of scaling up climate action with a view to achieving meaningful outcomes from the deliberations on all elements and setting the NCQG in 2024, taking into account the needs and priorities of developing countries;
- also acknowledges the need for substantive progress in the deliberations on the NCQG and include, *inter alia*, quantity, quality, scope, and access features, as well as sources of funding, of the goal and transparency arrangements to track progress towards achievement of the goal, without prejudice to other elements that will also be considered as the deliberations evolve, including matters relating to time frame; and
- acknowledges that deliberations on the NCQG should build on lessons learned from the goal of developed countries of mobilizing jointly USD 100 billion per year by 2020 in the context of meaningful mitigation actions and transparency on implementation and taking into account the needs and priorities of developing countries.

The CMA requests the Co-Chairs of the *ad hoc* work programme, with a view to significantly advancing substantive progress in 2023, to, among other actions aimed at improving openness and transparency:

- develop and publish a 2023 workplan by March 2023, including the themes for the TED;
- invite parties, constituted bodies, operating entities of the Financial Mechanism, international financial institutions, and non-party stakeholders to submit views on each TED;
- facilitate the broader involvement of ministers of finance, non-state actors, MDBs, the private sector, and other stakeholders;
- provide information on the discussions held and present information on the way forward, including possible options, following each TED and in their annual report on the *ad hoc* work programme with a view to achieving the objective of setting the NCQG and informing the deliberations at CMA 5 and the high-level ministerial dialogue on the new collective quantified goal on climate finance in 2023.

Parties are invited to submit views on the issues to be addressed as part of the workplan and the Secretariat is requested to prepare a synthesis report on the submissions. The CMA will continue its consideration of this matter at CMA 5.

**Matters relating to funding arrangements for loss and damage associated with the adverse effects of climate change, including a focus on addressing loss and damage:** This item is summarized under the COP.

**Development and Transfer of Technologies and Implementation of the Technology Mechanism: Joint annual report of the Technology Executive Committee and CTCN:** This item is summarized under the SBI/SBSTA.

**First periodic assessment:** This item is summarized under the SBI.

**Capacity Building under the Paris Agreement:** This item is summarized under the SBI.

**Matters relating to the LDCs:** This item was referred to the Subsidiary Bodies by the CMA and COP. The SBs could not reach agreement and further discussion took place under the CMA and COP. The discussions are summarized under the COP.

**Report of the Forum on the Impact of the Implementation of Response Measures:** This item was taken up under the COP, CMP and CMA. Discussions are summarized under the COP.

**Guidance on Cooperative Approaches referred to in Article 6.2:** This item focused on further work related to guidance on Article 6.2 of the Paris Agreement to enable the operationalization and scaling up of cooperative approaches. In its opening plenary on [6 November](#), the CMA referred this item to the SBSTA, which discussed it in a contact group and informal consultations, co-facilitated by Co-Facilitators Kuki Soejachmoen (Indonesia) and Peer Stiansen (Norway), through the first week of the conference. Parties also conducted conversations in “informal informals.”

During the SBSTA informal consultations, parties focused on, *inter alia*:

- registries for tracking, including the international registry;
- the centralized accounting and reporting platform (CARP);
- the Article 6 database;
- the Article 6 technical expert review;
- outline of the Article 6 technical expert review report;
- training programme for technical experts participating in the Article 6 technical expert review;

- outline for the initial report and updated initial report; and
- tables for submitting the agreed electronic format (AEF).

In addition, they exchanged views on elements to be included in the “cover” part of the decision on this item, including capacity building, and mandates for further work for the Secretariat and the SBSTA. In their discussions, parties drew from the SBSTA Chair’s informal note issued prior to SBSTA 57 ([SBSTA57/A6.2/InfDoc](#)).

On registries, parties discussed: applicability of the guidance to different country circumstances, including countries that wish, or do not wish, to use the international registry; and interoperability, including a communication protocol to ensure all registries “speak to one another” and appointing registry administrators to coordinate with one another.

On the CARP and Article 6 database, parties discussed, *inter alia*: their respective functions, unique identifiers, and common nomenclatures.

On the technical expert review, discussions focused on its guiding principles and scope, information to be reviewed, composition of the expert review team, and procedures and format of the review.

Throughout the week, parties underscored the significant amount of technical work under this item and called for focusing on priority issues for operationalizing Article 6.2, such as core operational guidance over voluntary guidelines. Parties expressed different views on how elaborate, or detailed, the guidance from the CMA should be. They identified the need for a holistic approach to Article 6.2 guidance, and for taking into account various interlinkages and interdependencies with the Article 6.4 mechanism and related structures and processes, including the international registry and Article 6.4 registry.

In its closing plenary, on [12 November](#), the SBSTA adopted conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2022/L.23). SBSTA Chair Mpanu Mpanu noted parties had not yet reached agreement on a draft decision on this item and said he would bring unresolved issues to the attention of the CMA President for his further guidance on next steps.

This item was then discussed under the CMA, throughout the second week of the conference, in informal consultations co-facilitated by Stiansen and Soejachmoen. Parties also met in informal informals during the week.

On the international registry, parties converged toward a bridging proposal to accommodate two views on its function, namely a recording and accounting registry and a registry that also allows the movement of units.

On the CARP and database, parties called for, *inter alia*: explaining the interoperability between the two; clarifying the database’s functionality and the information it will capture; further elaborating on the consistency check procedure for information submitted; and further work on common nomenclatures.

On the initial report outline, several groups and parties agreed that the outline and the report’s review were priorities at this CMA meeting. Parties diverged on whether to include optional illustrative elements of information in the outline, with two developing countries opposing on the grounds that this would introduce further requirements. They finally agreed not to include the illustrative elements.

On the AEF, parties diverged on the specificity of the required information, with one developing country group stressing the need for many countries to first test the tables’ usability, given



their insufficient prior experience in this area, and suggesting provisionally approving the AEF.

In the closing contact group meeting on 19 November, parties agreed to forward a decision to the CMA closing plenary. Co-Chair Stiansen described the outcome as comprehensive, saying it will “help us move forward toward the implementation of Article 6.2 in order to achieve ambition, which is so dear to us.” Commending parties for their hard work, YOUTH NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS underscored environmental integrity and respect for human rights and Indigenous Peoples’ rights as prerequisites for “getting cooperative approaches right” and lamented weak interoperability between Articles 6.2 and 6.4. The COP Presidency congratulated the “Article 6 family” for the outcomes under all Article 6 items, commending parties for their constructive and solutions-oriented spirit, and noting the outcomes send a positive signal to all stakeholders. Parties held a moment of silence for former Article 6 facilitator Hugh Sealy who passed away earlier in 2022.

On 20 November, the CMA adopted the decision.

**CMA Decision:** In its decision (FCCC/PA/CMA/2022/L.15), comprising 32 pages, the CMA, *inter alia*:

- encourages parties to test the draft AEF and provide feedback via the submission portal by 30 April 2023, and requests the Secretariat to organize a hybrid workshop on the AED prior to SBSTA 58 and to continue its work on the draft AEF with a view to finalizing a recommendation on the AED for consideration by CMA 5;
- decides that a participating party that identifies information as confidential should provide the basis for protecting such information;
- requests the Secretariat to implement and maintain the training programme for technical experts participating in the Article 6 technical expert reviews, to report to SBSTA 58, make available as soon as possible an initial version of related courses and, no later than December 2023, make available a course related to the requirements of initial reports;
- requests the Secretariat to include any cases of persistent inconsistencies and/or non-responsiveness by a participating party to recommendations arising from the technical expert review in the annual compilation and synthesis of the technical expert review results;
- invites party submissions and requests the SBSTA to develop recommendations for CMA 5 on the special circumstances of LDCs and SIDS, on reviewing confidential information, and on inconsistencies and non-responsiveness in the context of the reviews, and recommendations for CMA 6 on further guidance on corresponding adjustments for multi-year and single-year NDCs, and on whether internationally transferred mitigation outcomes (ITMOs) could include emission avoidance;
- also invites party submissions and requests the SBSTA to develop further recommendations for CMA 5 relating to, *inter alia*, reporting and review under Article 6.2, authorizations, use of ITMOs, including toward NDCs and other international mitigation purposes, the international registry, and common nomenclatures;
- requests the Secretariat to expedite the implementation of the Article 6.2 capacity-building programme and mandates various capacity-building-related activities and outputs, including a

workshop on initial report-related challenges before April 2023 with submissions, a technical paper, and a manual containing illustrative elements of information;

- requests the Secretariat to develop the CARP and, *inter alia*, provide an interim solution by January 2023 and make available a test version by June 2024;
- mandates technical work relating to the Article 6 database;
- requests the Secretariat to implement the international registry, including an interim solution, and to establish a voluntary forum of Article 6 registry administrators and an online platform to support this forum;

The decision also adopts guidance and outlines contained in seven annexes, namely;

- on tracking, in Annex I, the CMA provides guidance relating to registries, including their form, functions and processes, and interoperability, and to the international registry, guidance relating to the CARP, including its form and functions, and common nomenclatures, and guidance relating to the Article 6 database, including its form and functions, and a consistency check procedure;
- on guidelines for the technical expert review, in Annex II, the CMA specifies the review’s guiding principles, scope, information to be reviewed, timing and sequencing, format, procedures, confidentiality, roles of the parties, the review team and the Secretariat, institutional arrangements, and report;
- on the technical expert review report, in Annex III, the CMA provides outlines for the initial report and updated initial report, and regular information; and
- in Annexes IV-VII, the CMA provides the main parameters for the training programme for technical expert review technical experts (Annex IV), the outline for the initial report and updated initial report (Annex V), the outline for regular information (Annex VI), and a draft version of the AED (Annex VII).

#### **Rules, Modalities and Procedures for the Mechanism**

**Established by Article 6.4:** This item focused on further work related to guidance on Article 6.4 of the Paris Agreement to enable its operationalization, including based on recommendations contained in the report of the Article 6.4 Supervisory Body ([FCCC/PA/CMA/2022/6](#) and [Add.1](#)). In its opening plenary on [6 November](#), the CMA referred most work under this item to the SBSTA, which discussed it in informal consultations, co-facilitated by Kate Hancock (Australia) and Sonam Tashi (Bhutan), throughout the first week of the conference. Parties also conducted conversations in “informal informals.”

During the SBSTA informal consultations, parties drew on the SBSTA Chair’s informal note ([SBSTA57/A.6.4/InfDoc](#)). Discussions focused on, *inter alia*: processes for implementing the use of certified emission reductions (CERs) towards first or first updated NDCs; host party reporting; the mechanism registry; administrative and adaptation shares of proceeds; delivering overall mitigation in global emissions (OMGE); and the “cover” part of the CMA decision.

On processes for the use of CERs, several parties called for clear labeling to make it clear CERs are not ITMOs.

On host party reporting, parties discussed differences, overlap and possible synergies and duplication between Article 6.4 and Article 6.2 reporting, with some suggesting that reports submitted under Article 6.4 can be used to meet Article 6.2 reporting requirements

if and when emission reductions are authorized as ITMOs. They also exchanged views on the timing of authorizations of Article 6.4 emission reductions (A6.4ERs).

On the registry, countries drew attention to the relationship between the Article 6.4 registry and the Article 6.2 international registry, highlighting the need to unpack this relationship, ensure interoperability, align nomenclatures, and demarcate a division of labor between the two. Several groups and parties stressed linkages to registry discussions under Article 6.2, noting a divergence in views on the roles and functions of the two registries, including accounting, tracking, and nomenclature.

On OMGE, parties debated the applicability of OMGE cancellations to “non-authorized” A6.4ERs.

On the “cover” part of the decision, parties diverged on the urgency of considering emission avoidance and conservation enhancement activities. Parties also discussed elements relating to the Secretariat’s capacity-building programme.

During the first week, in parallel with the SBSTA discussions, the CMA also convened in a contact group, co-chaired by Kate Hancock (Australia) and Sonam Tashi (Bhutan), to hear views on elements to be included in the CMA decision under this item relating to the report by the Article 6.4 Supervisory Body on its first months of operation and recommendations on its rules of procedure, share of proceeds, and activities involving removals.

Parties commended the Supervisory Body, noting the short time available for the Body to advance work in 2022, but also stressed the need for further progress, highlighting: the need to indicate priority issues for the Supervisory Body’s work in 2023; and the need to focus on revision of Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) methodologies, baselines, and additionality guidance.

Parties generally welcomed the Supervisory Body’s recommendations for its rules of procedure, and the levels for the share of proceeds for administrative expenses of the Article 6.4 mechanism. They, however, raised several concerns on recommendations on removals, including absence of safeguards and provisions for reversals, and lack of differentiation between different removal types. Many favored mandating the Body to continue work on the recommendations.

In its closing plenary, on [12 November](#), the SBSTA adopted conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2022/L.21). SBSTA Chair Mpanu Mpanu noted parties had not yet reached agreement on a draft decision and said he would bring unresolved issues to the attention of the CMA President.

This item was then discussed under the CMA, during the second week of the conference, in a contact group and informal consultations. Parties also met in informal informals throughout the week. The CMA mandate covered: report of the Article 6.4 Supervisory Body and text forwarded from the Article 6.4 SBSTA discussions.

On the Supervisory Body’s recommendations, parties raised further concerns relating to guidance on removals, including related to environmental integrity and environmental and social safeguards and human and Indigenous Peoples’ rights. They converged on mandating the Body to continue its work on removals and report back to CMA 5.

On the “cover” part of the decision, parties called for setting 2023 as the deadline to finalize work on various priority areas and ensuring a dedicated support structure and sufficient funds. On host party reporting, parties exchanged views on ways to avoid creating

duplication in reporting obligations, identified as a concern by developing countries. On the registry, two groups underscored the need to clarify what non-authorized units are, their uses, and the process for issuing them. A developing country group disagreed, saying that parties have “nothing to do” with non-authorized A6.4ERs.

In the final contact group meeting on 19 November, parties agreed to forward a decision to the CMA closing plenary.

On 20 November, the CMA adopted the decision.

**CMA Decision:** In its decision (FCCC/PA/CMA/2022/L.14), the CMA, *inter alia*:

- adopts the rules of procedure of the Article 6.4 mechanism Supervisory Body;
- requests the SBSTA to develop recommendations for CMA 6 on further responsibilities of the Supervisory Body and parties that host Article 6.4 activities to support the application of national arrangements for the mechanism;
- requests the SBSTA to develop recommendations for CMA 5, parties and observers to make submissions by 15 March 2023, and the Secretariat to prepare a synthesis report for SBSTA 58 and to organize a technical expert dialogue between SBSTA 58 and 59 on emission avoidance and conservation enhancement activities, connection of the mechanism registry to the international registry and other registries, and provision of a statement by the host party to the Supervisory Body specifying whether it authorizes Article 6.4ERs for use toward NDCs and/or other international mitigation purposes;
- requests the Secretariat to expedite the implementation of its Article 6.4 mechanism capacity-building programme;
- invites parties and observers to make submissions by 15 March 2023 and requests the Supervisory Body to consider these views in further developing recommendations involving removals for consideration by CMA 5;
- requests the Supervisory Body to further develop recommendations on the application of the requirements relating to methodologies for consideration by CMA 5; and
- requests the Supervisory Body to facilitate tasks related to the transition of CDM activities by developing and operationalizing a procedure for requesting transition, by no later than June 2023.

Annex I to the decision, on elaboration of the processes defined in the rules, modalities and procedures for the Article 6.4 mechanism, provides further guidance on processes for implementing the transition of activities from the CDM to the Article 6.4 mechanism, processes for the use of CERs towards first or updated NDCs, host party reporting, operation of the mechanism registry, processes for administrative and adaptation shares of proceeds, and processes for delivering OMGE. Annex II contains the rules of procedure of the Article 6.4 mechanism Supervisory Body.

**Work Programme under the Framework for Non-market Approaches (NMA) Referred to in Article 6.8:** This item focused on operationalizing and mandating work under the NMA work programme of Article 6.8 of the Paris Agreement ([FCCC/SBSTA/2022/8](#) and [FCCC/SBSTA/2022/9](#)). In its opening plenary on [6 November](#), the CMA referred work under this item to the SBSTA, which discussed it in a contact group, co-chaired by Maria Al Jishi (Saudi Arabia) and Jacqueline Ruesga (New Zealand), through the first week of the conference. The contact group was convened as the second meeting of the Glasgow Committee on Non-market Approaches. Parties also met in informal informals.

In the SBSTA contact group, parties began their deliberations drawing on the SBSTA Chair's informal note ([SBSTA57/A/6.8/Inf.Doc](#)). Discussions focused on potential sections of the draft decision on: the schedule for implementing the activities of the Article 6.8. work programme; additional focus areas of the work programme activities; a coordination network and working groups; the UNFCCC web-based platform; review of the work programme activities in 2026; and cross-cutting matters.

On the implementation schedule, discussions revolved around possible phases, and related assessments, of the work programme. On additional focus areas, parties reflected on how to link a long list of proposed additional areas to three areas already identified in the Glasgow decision on Article 6.8 (4/CMA.3).

On a coordination network and working groups, many developing country groups, opposed by developed countries, viewed these would be necessary to help speed up operationalization of the framework for NMA. On the 2026 review, many said specifying related inputs would be premature.

On the web-based platform, parties discussed, *inter alia*, its focus and scope, functions, inputs, and management. Developed countries supported a "matchmaking" platform, with manual and automated matching of needs and support, while developed countries preferred it record existing NMAs and, by doing so, help identify related opportunities. On crosscutting matters, two developing country groups called for capacity building to increase understanding of NMAs, while many developed countries questioned the need for a separate programme.

During its closing plenary, on [12 November](#), the SBSTA adopted conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2022/L.24). SBSTA Chair Mpanu Mpanu noted parties had not yet reached agreement on a draft decision and said he would bring unresolved issues to the attention of the CMA President.

This item was then discussed under the CMA during the second week of the conference in a contact group and informal consultations. Parties also met in informal informals through the week. The CMA continued to debate the draft text forwarded from the SBSTA.

On the implementation schedule, parties exchanged views on a Co-Facilitators' bridging proposal consisting of having two implementation periods, with activities mandated only for the first one, and, instead of assessing these periods, mandating only inputs from the CMA instead. On the additional focus areas, they continued to discuss ways to streamline potential additional focus areas, with many supporting clustering these under the three focus areas agreed in Glasgow, calling for additional submissions, and mandating the Secretariat to produce a related synthesis report. On a coordination network and working groups, most parties supported a proposal to mandate further work by the Secretariat on relevant best practices under the UNFCCC.

On the platform, a developing country group laid out its vision of how actors involved with NMAs and support would first register relevant information via the platform, followed by both "roundtable working groups" to facilitate their matching and in-session workshops summarizing related outcomes.

In the closing contact group meeting on 19 November, parties agreed to forward a decision to the CMA closing plenary.

On 20 November, the CMA adopted the decision.

**CMA Decision:** The CMA decision (FCCC/PA/CMA/2022/L.13) contains five substantive sections:

- on the schedule for implementing the work programme activities, the CMA adopts the schedule and requests the Glasgow Committee on NMAs to continue the work programme activities in two phases, focusing, in 2023-2024, on identifying and framing all relevant elements of the activities and operationalizing the UNFCCC web-based platform and, in 2025-2026, on fully implementing the activities, and also requests the Glasgow Committee to undertake expedited and simple assessment of the progress and outcomes of the first phase;
- on the UNFCCC web-based platform for NMAs, the CMA requests the Secretariat to develop and operationalize the UNFCCC web-based platform for recording and exchanging information on NMAs, and decides that the platform is intended to facilitate opportunities to connect participating parties that record and exchange information, including on NMAs seeking support, with parties and entities making support available, and notes that recording information on the platform neither creates any rights or obligations or represents endorsement or approval of the NMA;
- on the platform, the CMA also requests the Secretariat to organize an in-session workshop, in conjunction with each meeting of the Glasgow Committee, to exchange information on NMAs and to prepare a report of each workshop;
- on additional focus areas, the CMA requests the Glasgow Committee to identify and recommend additional focus areas, taking into consideration experiences in implementing NMAs and information provided on the web-based platform, for consideration by the CMA;
- on enhanced networking and collaboration on NMAs, the CMA requests the SBSTA Chair to invite representatives of relevant UNFCCC constituted bodies and institutional arrangements under the Paris Agreement and/or the Convention to a meeting held in conjunction with SBSTA 58, with the aim of enhancing collaboration with the Glasgow Committee, and requests the Secretariat to prepare a technical paper for consideration by the third meeting of the Glasgow Committee on possibilities for enhancing engagement with public and private sector stakeholders at the Committee's meetings; and
- on cross-cutting matters, requests the Secretariat to include activities related to the work programme under the framework for NMAs as part of its broader capacity-building programme related to Paris Agreement Article 6.

**Report of the Committee to Facilitate Implementation and Promote Compliance:** The Paris Agreement Implementation and Compliance Committee (PAICC) facilitates implementation of and promotes compliance with the Paris Agreement. This matter focused on considering the PAICC's annual report and the remaining rules of procedure of the PAICC which were not adopted at CMA 3. It was first taken up in plenary on [6 November](#), and subsequently in a contact group, co-chaired by Kunzang (Bhutan) and Arne Riedl (Germany).

On 17 November, the CMA adopted a decision.

**CMA Decision:** In its decision (FCCC/PA/CMA/2022/L.1), the CMA, *inter alia*:

- adopts the PAICC rules of procedure contained in an annex, which include: their objective and scope; definitions; members and alternate members; election, roles, and functions of the Co-Chairs; dates, notice and location of meetings; decision making and voting; and others; and

- encourages parties to ensure sufficient allocation of resources when considering the budget of the Legal Affairs division of the Secretariat for the biennium 2024-2025 in support to the PAICC's work.

**Administrative, Financial and Institutional Matters:** These items were referred to the SBI, where the decisions are summarized.

**Conclusion of the Session:** Parties adopted the draft report (FCCC/PA/CMA/2022/L.2). The CMA adopted a resolution expressing profound gratitude to the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt for hosting COP 27 in Sharm El-Sheikh, and requesting the Egyptian government to convey their gratitude the city and people of Sharm El-Sheikh for their hospitality and warmth (FCCC/PA/CMA/2022/L.3).

### **Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP 17)**

**Organizational Matters: Adoption of the agenda:** The CMP adopted its agenda (FCCC/KP/CMP/2022/1) during its opening plenary on [6 November](#).

**Election of additional officers:** This item is summarized under the COP.

**Organization of work:** The CMP agreed to the organization of work, with two items, on national communications by Annex I parties and on annual compilation and accounting for Annex B parties, deferred to CMP 18.

**Credentials:** The CMP adopted the credentials report ([FCCC/KP/CMP/2022/8](#)).

**Reports of the Subsidiary Bodies: SBSTA:** The CMP took note of the oral report by SBSTA Chair Mpanu Mpanu and the SBSTA 56 and 57 reports (FCCC/SBSTA/2022/L.17 and FCCC/SBSTA/2022/6).

**SBI:** The CMP took note of the oral report by SBI Chair Karlsen and the SBI 56 and 57 reports ([FCCC/SBI/2022/10](#) and [Add.1](#) and FCCC/SBI/2022/L.18). The SBI also took note of the report of the administrator of the international transaction log under the Kyoto Protocol ([FCCC/KP/CMP/2022/5](#)).

**Reporting to and from Annex I Parties: National communications:** This item was deferred to CMP 18.

**Annual compilation and accounting report for the second commitment period for Annex B parties under the Protocol (2019, 2020, 2021, 2022):** This item was deferred to CMP 18.

**Date of completion of the expert review process under Article 8 of the Kyoto Protocol for the second commitment period:** To fulfill its emission reduction commitments under the Kyoto Protocol, a party may, until the hundredth day after the date set by the CMP for the completion of the expert review process for the last year of the commitment period (true-up period), continue to acquire Emission Reduction Units under the Kyoto Protocol from the preceding commitment period. The CMP referred the consideration of this item to SBI 56, which recommended a draft decision (pages 11-12 of FCCC/SBI/2022/10/Add.1) for the CMP's consideration.

On 17 November, the CMP adopted the decision.

**CMP Decision:** In its decision (FCCC/SBI/2022/10/Add.1), the CMP, *inter alia*:

- decides that the expert review process under Article 8 of the Kyoto Protocol for the final year of the second commitment period shall be completed by 1 June 2023, and, if the expert review process is not completed by that date, it shall continue, and the date of completion shall be the date of publication of

the final inventory review report for the final year of the second commitment period, and urges parties, expert review teams, and the Secretariat to expedite the review process to meet that deadline;

- decides that the report upon expiration of the additional period for fulfilling commitments for the second commitment period shall be submitted as soon as practicable but not later than 45 days after the expiration of the true-up period; and
- decides that the Secretariat should provide updated information, including on: inventory data for each year of, and total emissions over, the second commitment period; total quantity of units held in party holding accounts, cancellation accounts and the retirement account; the total quantity of aggregated holdings in the CDM registry; and the review processes remaining to be completed and when outstanding stages are expected to be completed.

**Matters Relating to the CDM:** This item focused on: the annual report of the CDM Executive Board ([FCCC/KP/CMP/2022/7](#)), including related guidance; and guidance for the transition of the CDM based on guidance provided by paragraph 75(b) of the annex to Decision 3/CMA.3 (on the transfer of CERs to the Paris Agreement Article 6.4 mechanism registry), including drawing on a technical paper prepared by the Secretariat on technical and process-related aspects for the CDM registry in relation to the transfer of eligible CERs to the Article 6.4 mechanism registry ([KP/CDM/TP/1](#)).

This item was first taken up in the CMP opening plenary on [6 November](#), which established a contact group, co-chaired by Alick Muvundika (Zambia) and Kazuhisa Koakutsu (Japan). The group met in informal consultations during the first and second week.

During the first week, parties exchanged views on whether to set time frames or mandate technical work by the Secretariat first on: issuance and voluntary cancellation processes for pre-2020 CERs; work on methodologies; accreditation; and temporary measures for afforestation and reforestation activities. They also discussed the end date for the CDM Executive Board's (EB) operations more broadly, and one country's proposal to allow for voluntary cancellations of post-2020 CERs.

In parallel, the specific issue of transfer of CERs to the Paris Agreement Article 6.4 mechanism registry was discussed under the SBI during the first week. These discussions and related SBI conclusions are summarized under the SBI.

During the second week, parties worked on draft decision text, which contained a placeholder for text forwarded from the SBI on CER transfers. Regarding the various transition processes, some preferred setting specific dates while others called for linkages to the operationalization of the Article 6.4 mechanism. Yet others suggested mandating the Secretariat to conduct technical work. They eventually converged on the latter option.

Parties also discussed whether to include afforestation and reforestation as activities subject to the temporary measures, and finally converged on requesting the CDM EB to assess the technical feasibility of allowing registration, issuance, and renewal requests for related activities.

On the proposal to allow voluntary cancellations of post-2020 CERs, many expressed opposition, noting CMP 16 had already decided that issuance for post-2020 emission reductions is not possible. Parties eventually agreed not to include paragraphs on this matter.

On management of financial resources, proposals included undertaking holistic assessment of these resources and how they should be used, and allocating a specific amount to the Adaptation Fund.

On the transfer of CERs to the Article 6.4 mechanism registry, discussed during the first week under the SBI, parties agreed to remove language related to the use of CERs toward NDCs and, in a final contact group meeting on [17 November](#), parties agreed that the host country would be notified and would have a set amount of time to object.

In its closing plenary on 20 November, the CMP adopted the decision.

**CMP Decision:** In its decision (FCCC/KP/CMP/2022/L.5), the CMP, *inter alia*:

- requests the Secretariat to prepare a technical paper to support the consideration, by CMP 18, of the functioning and operation of the processes and institutions of the CDM in the future, including appropriate time frames, with a view to avoiding a gap before the operationalization of the corresponding processes under the Article 6.4 mechanism, including relating to issuance of pre-2020 CERs, voluntary cancellations of CERs, new and revised methodologies, and the accreditation process;
- requests the CDM EB to assess the technical feasibility of allowing submissions of requests for registration issuance and renewal of afforestation and reforestation activities under the temporary measures, and to revise the procedure for the temporary measures as necessary;
- requests the CDM registry administrator to identify CERs held in the CDM registry that are eligible for transfer to the Article 6.4 mechanism registry;
- decides that the transfer of eligible CERs shall be effected through administrative cancellation in a dedicated administrative cancellation account in the CDM registry;
- requests the CDM EB to, *inter alia*, develop and implement a procedure for requesting the transfer of eligible CERs to the Article 6.4 mechanism registry, and to develop and implement a procedure that provides to the host party a written notice of the transfer request and effects the transfer if no objection from the host party is received within a time frame to be specified by the CDM EB;
- requests the CDM registry administrator to, *inter alia*, implement modifications to the CDM registry necessary for the transfers of eligible CERs; and
- recalls its request to the SBI to review the status of the CDM Trust Fund and to develop recommendations for consideration by CMP 18.

**Matters Relating to Joint Implementation:** The CMP took note of the annual report of the Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee (JISC) ([FCCC/KP/CMP/2022/6](#)).

**CMP Decision:** In its decision (FCCC/KP/CMP/2022/L.4), the CMP terminates the JISC and requests the Secretariat to take the necessary steps to conclude the JISC's operations, including making recommendations for managing residual resources and any other relevant matters to CMP 18 in 2023.

**Matters Relating to the Adaptation Fund:** The Adaptation Fund was set up in 2001 to support adaptation projects and programmes in developing countries that are parties to the Kyoto Protocol. It is supervised by the Adaptation Fund Board. As well as reporting to the CMP, as of 2019 the Fund now also serves under the

CMA on matters relating to the Paris Agreement. The Fund received finances from a share of proceeds from the CDM, as well as other sources.

This item was taken up by the CMA, CMP and SBI on [6 November](#). The CMP considered sub-items on the report of the Adaptation Fund Board ([FCCC/KP/CMP/2022/4-FCCC/PA/CMA/2022/3](#) and [FCCC/KP/CMP/2022/4/Add.1-FCCC/PA/CMA/2022/3/Add.1](#)) and the fourth review of the Fund ([FCCC/TP/2022/1](#)). The fourth review and the Board report were taken up in informal consultations facilitated by Diann Black-Layne (Antigua and Barbuda) and Eva Schreuder (Netherlands).

On [12 November](#), the SBI adopted conclusions containing a draft decision on the fourth review of the Adaptation Fund (FCCC/SBI/2022/L.22), which asks for the CMP to further consider the report of the Adaptation Fund Board.

Negotiations continued during the second week under the CMP and CMA.

Developing countries favored language noting that funding was inadequate and needed to be increased significantly. They sought text pointing out the need for more sustainable and predictable resources. One group of developed countries described the state of funding as a “systemic failure” and “false pledges” by developed countries and urging greater funding and easier access. Developed countries insisted that voluntary contributions had increased, and preferred more positive language. There was also disagreement over whether text on additional funding should specify just SIDS and LDCs, which some developed and developing countries supported, but other developing countries did not.

The group concluded its work on 18 November, agreeing on a CMP decision on the fourth review of the Adaptation Fund, and separate but similar CMP and CMA decisions on the report of the Adaptation Fund Board. The CMA decision on the Board is summarized under the CMA.

**CMP Decision: Report of the Adaptation Fund Board:** In its decision (FCCC/KP/CMP/2022/L.6), the CMP takes note of various actions, decisions, and information, ranging from funds received as of June/July 2022, to contributions that remain outstanding, and the number of projects implemented. It also welcomes financial pledges made by a number of governments, underscores the urgency of scaling up financial resources, and stresses actions to promote adequate and predictable financing.

**CMP Decision: Fourth review of the Adaptation Fund:** In its decision (FCCC/SBI/2022/L.22), the CMP notes with concern ongoing issues of sustainability, adequacy, and predictability of funding from the Adaptation Fund given the current prices of CERs. It recognizes the comparative advantages of the Adaptation Fund, stresses the importance of financial contributions, and asks SBI to begin the fifth review of the Adaptation Fund in June 2025.

**Capacity Building under the Protocol:** On [17 November](#), the CMP took note of the SBI 56 conclusions on capacity building under the Protocol ([FCCC/SBI/2022/10](#), page 22).

**Report of the Forum on the Impact of the Implementation of Response Measures:** This issue was taken up under the COP, CMP, and CMA and was the subject of extensive negotiations throughout the meeting. A joint decision was finally adopted on 20 November. The discussions are summarized under the COP.

**Report of the Compliance Committee:** The CMP took note of the report ([FCCC/KP/CMP/2022/2](#)). On 17 November, the CMP adopted a decision.

**CMP Decision:** In its decision (FCCC/KP/CMP/2022/L.1), the CMP adopts the amendments to the Compliance Committee's rules of procedure contained in the annex and encourages parties to ensure sufficient allocation of resources when considering the budget of the Secretariat's Legal Affairs division for the biennium 2024-2025 in support of the work of the Compliance Committee.

**Report on the High-Level Ministerial Round Table on Increased Ambition of Kyoto Protocol Commitments:** The Presidency held consultations on this item, which had been on the agenda at previous CMPs but on which parties had not yet reached agreement. Parties did not reach consensus at this CMP either, and President Shoukry informed the CMP on [17 November](#) that this item would be included on the provisional agenda for CMP 18.

**Administrative, Financial and Institutional Matters:** These items were referred to the SBI, where the decisions are summarized.

**Conclusion of the Session:** Parties adopted the draft report (FCCC/KP/CMP/2022/L.2). The CMP adopted a resolution expressing profound gratitude to the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt for hosting COP 27 in Sharm El-Sheikh, and requesting the Egyptian government to convey their gratitude the city and people of Sharm El-Sheikh for their hospitality and warmth (FCCC/KP/CMP/2022/L.3).

### **Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI 57)**

**Organizational Matters: Adoption of the agenda:** On [6 November](#), parties adopted the agenda ([FCCC/SBI/2022/12](#)) with the following oral amendments:

- adding a new agenda item on financial and technical support of reporting and review under Article 13 of the Paris Agreement (on transparency);
- consideration of the review of the Adaptation Committee alongside the report of the Adaptation Committee; and
- deferring consideration of membership of the Adaptation Fund Board and of reporting and review of Annex I parties to SBI 58.

The sub-item on information contained in national communications from non-Annex I parties was held in abeyance.

**Election of officers other than the Chair:** Current Vice Chair, Juan Carlos Monterrey Gomez (Panama), and Rapporteur Aysin Turpanc (Türkiye), will remain in office until their successors are elected.

**Facilitative Sharing of Views:** The SBI took note of information provided by SBI Chair Mpanu Mpanu.

**Mandated events:** The SBI took note of information provided by the SBI Chair.

**Annex I Reporting: Status of submission and review of national communications and biennial reports from Annex I Parties; Compilation and synthesis of biennial reports; Report on national GHG inventory data from Annex I parties:** Parties agreed to defer consideration of these sub-items until SBI 58.

**Non-Annex I Reporting: Information contained in national communications:** This sub-item was held in abeyance.

**Report and terms of reference of the Consultative Group of Experts (CGE):** This item relates to the CGE, which assists developing countries in completing their national reports. Countries considered the report of the CGE ([FCCC/SBI/2022/16](#)) and problems, constraints, lessons learned, and capacity-building needs in preparing national communications and biennial update reports ([FCCC/SBI/2022/INF.12](#)) to help provide appropriate support to developing countries to complete their national reports under the

Paris Agreement. It was first taken up by the SBI on [6 November](#), and Sandra Motshwanedi (South Africa) and Aaron Kirby (Australia) co-facilitated informal consultations.

The SBI adopted conclusions on [12 November](#). During the COP closing plenary, ARMENIA expressed concerns over equitable geographical representation, noting the CGE could not finalize its work on the rules of procedure and asserting discrimination that affected some central European countries.

**SBI Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2022/L.21), the SBI, *inter alia*:

- welcomes the report of the CGE and takes note of the revised vision, mission, and metrics to measure the progress as well as strategic priorities for 2020-2026;
- requests the CGE to clearly reflect, in its next and subsequent annual progress reports to the SBI, how it has fulfilled its mandates to support implementation of the existing measurement, reporting and verification arrangements under the Convention by non-Annex I parties and to support implementation of the enhanced transparency framework under Article 13 of the Paris Agreement; and
- also requests the CGE to enhance its provision of technical advice and support to developing country parties for reporting information related to the modalities, procedures, and guidelines for the enhanced transparency framework.

**Financial and technical support:** This sub-item involves discussions on how to support developing countries in their efforts to complete their transparency reports under the Convention and Kyoto Protocol. Support for reporting under the Paris Agreement is a separate SBI agenda item. At this session, countries discussed the GEF's report on its efforts to support developing countries ([FCCC/SBI/2022/INF.15](#)). The SBI took this item up on 6 November, and informal consultations were co-facilitated by Tian Wang (China) and Helen Plume (New Zealand).

On [11 November](#), the SBI adopted conclusions.

**SBI Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2022/L.26), the SBI, *inter alia*:

- welcomes the information provided by the GEF, including on the operationalization of the Capacity-building initiative for Transparency (CBIT) and the financial support requested, approved and provided for the preparation of national communications (NCs), biennial update reports (BURs), including through the CBIT Global Coordination Platform;
- notes the increase in the allocation to the climate change focal area set aside for enabling activities, including the CBIT, from USD 165 million in the seventh GEF replenishment cycle to USD 220 million in the eighth;
- underscores the importance of providing adequate and predictable financial and technical support to developing country parties to meet their measurement, reporting and verification requirements under the Convention, and build and enhance their institutional and technical capacity on a continuous basis;
- notes the importance of providing timely responses to requests from developing country parties and recalled paragraphs 8-9 of Decision 10/CP.23, which encouraged the GEF to provide adequate support for reporting under the Convention to assist developing country parties in submitting requests and to further consider ways to improve its access modalities for developing country parties seeking such support;

- notes the improved procedures of the GEF for providing support to developing country parties and, recalling paragraph 4 of Decision 13/CP.25, further noted the invitation to the GEF and its implementing agencies to continue efforts to minimize the time between approval of project concepts, the development and approval of the related projects for preparing NCs and BURs, and the disbursement of funds; and
- notes the efforts of the GEF to improve and streamline its application process for preparing reports under the Convention and highlighted the importance of continuing such efforts.

**Summary reports on the technical analysis of BURs of non-Annex I parties:** The SBI took note of the [reports](#) published on the UNFCCC website.

**Matters relating to the CDM Registry:** This agenda item provides inputs to the CMP on operationalizing the transfer of CERs to the Paris Agreement Article 6.4 mechanism registry, including drawing on a technical paper prepared by the Secretariat on technical and process-related aspects for the CDM registry in relation to the transfer of eligible CERs to the Article 6.4 mechanism registry ([KP/CDM/TP/1](#)).

This item was taken up by the SBI on [6 November](#), and subsequently in informal consultations, co-facilitated by Sonam Tashi (Bhutan) and Kate Hancock (Australia). Discussions focused on clarifying the role of host countries in approving, or being informed of, the CER transitions and approving the CERs' use toward NDCs. Parties also discussed whether CERs in pending accounts should also be eligible for transfer.

During the SBI closing plenary, on [12 November](#), the SBI adopted conclusions. SBI Chair Karlsen noted that parties had been unable to conclude work on this item, and the CMP Presidency would inform parties on the way forward. CMP discussions on this issue, which took place during the second week of the conference, are summarized under the CMP.

**SBI Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2022/L.29), the SBI notes that it did not conclude consideration of the measures for implementing aspects of Decision 3/CMA.3 relating to the transfer of CERs from the CDM registry to the Article 6.4 mechanism registry. The SBI also agrees to recommend to CMP 17 consider this matter under its agenda item "Matters relating to the CDM," taking into account draft texts the SBI discussions at this session had generated.

**Report of the Administrator of the International Transaction Log under the Protocol:** The SBI recommended that the CMP take note of the information presented in the 2022 report ([FCCC/KP/CMP/2022/5](#)).

**Matters Relating to the Work Programme for Urgently Scaling up Mitigation Ambition:** This item is summarized under the CMA.

**Matters Relating to LDCs:** This item is summarized under the COP.

**National Adaptation Plans:** This item focused on considering information from the reports of the Adaptation Committee and the LEG, including on gaps and needs and the implementation of NAPs, and to take further action as appropriate. This item was first taken up by the SBI in plenary on [6 November](#), and subsequently in informal consultations, co-facilitated by Pepetua Latasi (Tuvalu) and Jens Fugl (Denmark) on [8](#) and [9 November](#), then several more times, including on [14 November](#), under the COP.

Discussions revolved around key issues such as how to express the need to urgently scale up adaptation finance and support, and whether to include references to improved access to the GCF. On the latter, several developed countries opposed inclusion, pointing to the separate agenda item on GCF guidance as the more appropriate forum for such discussions. Parties converged on concern around the low number of NAPs submitted and the need to facilitate access to adequate finance by developing countries, not only to formulate, but also to implement NAPs.

On [12 November](#), the SBI adopted conclusions, which notes it was unable to agree to a decision and forwarded the draft text to the COP for further consideration.

On 20 November, the COP adopted a decision. Additional language on financing for NAPs was included in the COP overarching cover decision.

**SBI Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2022/L.31), the SBI, *inter alia*, welcomes the reports for 2020-2022 on progress in the process to formulate and implement NAPs, and the information provided by the Adaptation Committee and the LEG on gaps and needs related to the process to formulate and implement NAPs, and the implementation of NAPs.

**COP Decision:** In its decision (FCCC/CP/2022/L.8), the COP, *inter alia*:

- expresses concern at the large number of countries that have not submitted their first NAP and notes the challenges, complexities and delays experienced by developing country parties in accessing funding and support from the GCF for the formulation and implementation of NAPs, particularly in relation to the submission and review of proposals for funding;
- invites the Adaptation Committee and LEG to continue formulating recommendations on ways to facilitate the mobilization of support for the formulation and implementation of NAPs and to submit the recommendations to the SCF for consideration;
- requests the Adaptation Committee and LEG to continue to identify the priority gaps and needs of developing countries related to the process to formulate and implement NAPs, the progress of each country in this process and any obstacles and challenges faced, enhance their work to address these, and include this information in their reports;
- requests the Adaptation Committee and LEG to organize training for developing country parties on addressing identified gaps and needs;
- invites other UNFCCC constituted bodies and relevant organizations to provide information to the Adaptation Committee and LEG on activities that aim to address gaps and needs related to the process to formulate and implement NAPs, including information on the regions and countries in which the constituted bodies and organizations provide support; and
- encourages relevant organizations to continue coordinating support related to the process to formulate, update and implement NAPs and to continue sharing lessons learned.

**Glasgow-Sharm El Sheikh Work Programme on the GGA:** This item is summarized under the CMA.

**Matters Relating to the Santiago Network under the WIM:** This item is summarized under the CMA.

### Development and Transfer of Technologies and Implementation of the Technology Mechanism: *Linkages between the Technology Mechanism and the Financial Mechanism*

**Discussions:** Discussions under this item aimed to strengthen collaboration between the bodies under the Technology Mechanism, and the operating entities of the Financial Mechanism, including the report of activities undertaken by the entities within the Technology Mechanism and the Financial Mechanism ([FCCC/SBI/2022/INF.6](#)). The item was first taken up by the SBI on [6 November](#), and subsequently in informal consultations co-facilitated by Maia Tskharvadze (Georgia) and Orly Jacob (Canada).

On 12 November, the SBI adopted conclusions and, on [17 November](#), the COP took note that the discussions will continue at SBI 58.

**SBI Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2022/L.24), the SBI agrees to continue its consideration of this matter at SBI 58 with a view to recommending a decision to COP 28.

**First periodic assessment:** This item focuses on conducting an assessment of the effectiveness and adequacy of the support provided to the Technology Mechanism in supporting the implementation of the Paris Agreement on matters relating to technology development and transfer. At this session, parties considered a report on the first periodic assessment ([FCCC/SBI/2022/13](#)). The item was first taken up on [6 November](#) and subsequently in informal consultations, co-facilitated by Vositha Wijenayake (Sri Lanka) and Elfriede More (Austria).

On [12 November](#), the SBI adopted conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2022/L.27) and recommended a draft decision, which the CMA adopted on 20 November.

**CMA Decision:** In its decision (FCCC/SBI/2022/L.27/Add.1), the CMA, *inter alia*:

- requests the Technology Executive Committee (TEC) and CTCN to include in their joint annual report for 2023, and in subsequent reports, information on actions undertaken in response to the recommendations contained in the final report;
- decides that the main challenges identified in the periodic assessment final report be given consideration in the GST;
- requests the Secretariat to consider experience in and lessons learned from undertaking the first periodic assessment in preparing for the second periodic assessment, including the incorporation of the activities under the technology framework, the implementation of technology action plans and the levels of support at different stages of the technology cycle, and taking into account the concern regarding membership composition of the TEC; and
- requests the SBI to initiate at its sixty-fourth session (2026) the second periodic assessment of the effectiveness and adequacy of the support provided to the Technology Mechanism in supporting the implementation of the Paris Agreement on matters relating to technology development and transfer with a view to it being completed by CMA 9.

**Poznan strategic programme on technology transfer:** The Poznan strategic programme aims to scale up the level of investment in technology transfer. At this session, parties considered a note on the status and successes of, challenges in and lessons learned from projects undertaken through the regional climate technology transfer and finance centres ([FCCC/SBI/2022/INF.13](#)). The item was taken

up on [6 November](#) and subsequently in informal consultations co-facilitated by Vositha Wijenayake (Sri Lanka) and Stephen Minas (Greece).

On [12 November](#), the SBI adopted its conclusions.

**SBI Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2022/L.28), the SBI, *inter alia*:

- notes with concern the challenges identified for project activities, especially the concerns raised about the African climate technology transfer and finance centre, and requests the CTCN to organize an open-ended and inclusive knowledge-sharing workshop with the African centre to be held in conjunction with the Africa regional climate weeks;
- invites the LDCs and SIDS that have not yet undertaken a Technology Needs Assessment and plan to do so to obtain support for it under GEF-8; and
- agrees to continue consideration of this matter at its sixty-first session (2024) with a view to taking stock of progress and successes in and lessons learned from implementing the Poznan strategic programme, and the results of the GST relating to technology, with a view to recommending a draft decision on this matter for consideration and adoption by COP 29.

**Matters Relating to the Adaptation Fund:** The SBI took up two matters relating to the Adaptation Fund Board: membership of the Board and fourth review of the Adaptation Fund ([FCCC/TP/2022/1](#)). These items were first taken on [6 November](#). On the issue of Board membership, parties agreed to defer their consideration of this sub-item to the next session.

Diann Black-Layne (Antigua and Barbuda) and Eva Schreuder (Netherlands) co-facilitated informal consultations on the fourth review of the Adaptation Fund. Delegates drafted SBI conclusions, which were adopted on [12 November](#). This draft decision, as well as a second decision on the Adaptation Fund, were subsequently adopted during the closing CMP plenary. The decision is summarized under the CMP.

**SBI Conclusions:** In its conclusions ([FCCC/SBI/2022/L.22](#)), the SBI recommends a draft CMP decision containing a number of recommendations for the Fund and SBI and entitled “Fourth review of the Adaptation Fund.”

**Matters Relating to Capacity Building:** At this session, parties considered the annual technical progress report of the Paris Committee on Capacity-building ([FCCC/SBI/2022/14](#)) and the report on the 11th Durban Forum on capacity-building ([FCCC/SBI/2022/11](#)). The item was first taken up on [6 November](#), and Juan Carlos Monterrey Gomez (Panama) and Roberta Ianna (Italy) co-facilitated informal consultations.

On [12 November](#), the SBI recommended a draft decision for the COP and the CMA, respectively. Both were adopted by the CMA and COP on [17 November](#).

**COP Decision:** In its decision (FCCC/SBI/2022/L.19), the COP, *inter alia*, welcomes the annual technical progress report of the Paris Committee on Capacity-building (PCCB) for 2021 and takes note of the recommendations therein and invites parties and relevant institutions, as appropriate, to provide support and resources to the PCCB for implementing its workplan for 2021-2024.

**CMA Decision:** In its decision, (FCCC/SBI/2022/L.20), the CMA, *inter alia*, welcomes the launch of the PCCB toolkit to assess capacity-building gaps and needs and invites parties and relevant institutions to consider using the toolkit to support their capacity gaps and needs assessment efforts.



**Gender:** On [6 November](#), the COP tasked the SBI to undertake work on this item. Informal consultations throughout the first week could not yield agreement. Deliberations continued under the COP, where these discussions are summarized.

**Matters Relating to Action for Climate Empowerment (ACE):** ACE is a term adopted by the UNFCCC to denote work under Article 6 of the Convention and Article 12 of the Paris Agreement. The overarching goal of ACE is to empower all members of society to engage in climate action. At this session, parties considered the report on the progress implementing the Glasgow work programme on Action for Climate Empowerment ([FCCC/SBI/2022/17](#)). The item was first taken up on [6 November](#), and informal consultations were co-facilitated by Pemy Gasela (South Africa) and Kaveh Guilanpour (Georgia).

On [12 November](#), the SBI adopted conclusions and recommended a decision to the COP and CMA, which were adopted on [17 November](#).

**COP/CMA Decisions:** In their final decisions (FCCC/SBI/2022/L.23), the COP and CMA, *inter alia*,

- adopt the four-year action plan under the Glasgow work programme on ACE, which focuses on immediate action through short-term, clear and time-bound activities, guided by the priority areas of the Glasgow work programme (policy coherence; coordinated action; tools and support; and monitoring evaluation and reporting), taking into account the six elements of ACE in a balanced manner;
- request the Secretariat to include in each annual summary report under the Glasgow work programme information on materials, resources and findings as set out in the action plan; and
- request the actions of the Secretariat set out in this decision to be subject to the availability of resources.

**Administrative, Financial and Institutional Matters:** This item was taken up briefly in the opening SBI plenary on [7 November](#), where parties agreed to establish a contact group. On [12 November](#) parties adopted draft conclusions during the SBI's closing plenary. The conclusions take note of the information contained in the relevant background documents ([FCCC/SBI/2022/INF.10](#) and [Add.1](#), [FCCC/SBI/2022/INF.11](#) and [FCCC/SBI/2022/INF.16](#)), and recommend two draft decisions: one for the COP and one for the CMP. On [17 November](#), the COP and CMP each adopted the decision forwarded by the SBI.

**COP/CMP Decision:** In their decisions (FCCC/SBI/2022/L.17, Add.1 and Add.2), the COP and CMP, *inter alia*:

- express concern about the high number of recommendations from the United Nations Board of Auditors not yet implemented by the Secretariat and urges the Executive Secretary to implement the recommendations;
- strongly urge parties that have not made contributions in full to the core budget for the current and/or previous bienniums to do so without further delay; and
- urge parties to further contribute to the Trust Fund for Participation in the UNFCCC Process to ensure the widest possible participation in the process in 2022-2023, and to the Trust Fund for Supplementary Activities to ensure a high level of implementation of the UNFCCC work programme.

**Reporting and review pursuant to Article 13 of the Paris Agreement:** *Provision of financial and technical support:* This sub-item focused on provision of support to developing countries for reporting and capacity building related to the Enhanced

Transparency Framework (ETF) of the Paris Agreement. It was first taken up by the CMA on [6 November](#), which referred the sub-item to the SBI.

The SBI discussed the item in informal consultations, co-facilitated by Tian Wang (China) and Helen Plume (New Zealand). The consultations convened four times, including on [11 November](#), when discussions revolved around, *inter alia*: requests to the GEF to increase its provision of resources for Biennial Transparency Reports; and references to a long-term workplan relating to challenges developing countries face when implementing the ETF. On the latter, parties converged on language around facilitating the development of sustainable institutional capacity of developing countries.

On [12 November](#), the SBI adopted conclusions. On [17 November](#), the CMA took note of the SBI's conclusions.

**SBI Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2022/L.25), the SBI, *inter alia*:

- notes the challenges that developing country parties face in implementing the ETF in a sustainable manner, including establishment and enhancement of national reporting systems within their respective national governments;
- invites parties and interested stakeholders to submit views, by 30 April 2023, on how to address these challenges; and
- agrees to continue the consideration of this matter at SBI 58, taking into account these submissions, with a view to facilitating the development of sustainable institutional capacity of developing countries, in particular LDCs and SIDS, pursuant to Paris Agreement Article 13 (transparency), and recommending a draft decision for consideration and adoption by CMA 5.

The SBI closed at 10:59 pm on Saturday, 12 November.

### **Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA 57)**

**Organizational Matters: Adoption of the agenda:** The SBSTA agreed to defer consideration of the technical review of GHG inventories of Annex I Parties, under the item annual reports on technical review, to SBSTA 58. The SBSTA then adopted the agenda ([FCCC/SBSTA/2022/7/Rev.1](#)).

**Election of Officers other than the Chair:** Current Vice-Chair Kakhaberi Mdivani (Georgia) and Rapporteur Zita Wilks (Gabon) remain in office until their successors are elected.

**Mandated events:** The SBSTA took note of reports from events held related to the development of reporting tools under the ETF, and for training experts to review biennial transparency reports.

**Matters Relating to Science and Review: Research and systemic observation:** This agenda item relates to efforts to promote and cooperate in research, systematic observation and the development of data archives. Often, this includes research dialogues and other efforts to strengthen the science-policy interface. The item was taken up by the SBSTA on [6 November](#) and subsequently in informal consultations, co-facilitated by Elizabeth Bush (US) and Ladislaus Chang'a (Tanzania).

On [12 November](#), the SBSTA adopted conclusions and recommended a draft decision for consideration and adoption by the COP.

**SBSTA Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2022/L.20), the SBSTA, *inter alia*, invites parties and relevant organizations to submit, via the submission portal by 31 August

2023, views on possible themes for and ways to organize Earth Information Day 2023, to be held in conjunction with SBSTA 59.

**COP Decision:** In its decision (FCCC/SBSTA/2022/L.20/Add.1), the COP, *inter alia*:

- emphasizes the need to address systematic observation gaps, particularly in developing countries and for ocean, mountain, desert and polar regions and the cryosphere to improve understanding of climate change, climate-related risks and tipping points, and adaptation limits and to ensure enhanced delivery of climate services and early warning systems; and
- notes with concern the existing gaps in the global climate observing system.

**Methodological Issues Under the Convention: Training programme for review experts for the technical review of GHG inventories of Annex I parties:** This item was first taken up in plenary on [6 November](#). Informal consultations convened, co-facilitated by Jae Jung (Republic of Korea) and Harry Vreuls (Netherlands). On [12 November](#), the SBSTA adopted conclusions.

**SBSTA Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2022/L.16), the SBSTA, *inter alia*, agrees to extend the implementation of the Convention-related training programme until the training programme for technical experts participating in the technical expert review of biennial transparency reports under the Paris Agreement begins. The SBSTA also agrees to consider this matter at the session following any Annex I party withdrawing from the Paris Agreement.

**Training programme for review experts for the technical review of biennial reports and national communications of Annex I parties:** This item was first taken up in plenary on [6 November](#). Informal consultations convened, co-facilitated by Jung and Vreuls. On 12 November, the SBSTA adopted conclusions.

**SBSTA Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2022/L.15), the SBSTA, *inter alia*, agrees to extend the implementation of the training programme until the training programme for technical experts participating in the technical expert review of biennial transparency reports begins. The SBSTA also agrees to consider this matter at the session following any Annex I party withdrawing from the Paris Agreement.

**Revision of UNFCCC reporting guidelines on annual inventories for Annex I parties:** This item was first taken up in plenary on [6 November](#). Informal consultations convened, co-facilitated by Thiago Mendes (Brazil) and Daniela Romano (Italy).

On [12 November](#), the SBSTA adopted conclusions that include a draft COP decision, which was adopted by the COP.

**COP Decision:** In its decision (FCCC/SBSTA/2022/L.19), the COP, *inter alia*,

- decides that, when reporting their annual greenhouse gas inventories under the Convention for the 2024 submission onward, Annex I parties that are not parties to the Paris Agreement that are using an approach for reporting emissions and removals from harvested wood products other than the production approach shall also provide supplementary information on emissions and removals from harvested wood products estimated using the production approach, either in their national inventory report, or using the common reporting tables under the enhanced transparency framework;
- decides that the global warming potential values, excluding the value for fossil methane used by Annex I parties to calculate the carbon dioxide equivalence of anthropogenic greenhouse gas

emissions by sources and removals by sinks in their reporting under the Convention shall be those based on the effects of GHGs over a 100-year time horizon listed in Table 8.A.1 of the contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the IPCC and that these values shall be applied by no later than 31 December 2024;

- decides that Annex I parties may also use other metrics (e.g., global temperature potential) to report supplemental information on aggregate emissions and removals of GHGs, expressed in carbon dioxide equivalence. In such cases, they shall provide in their national inventory report information on the values of the metrics used and the IPCC assessment report from which they were sourced; and
- decides to change the deadline for the submission by Annex I parties included that are parties to the Paris Agreement of their annual GHG inventories due in 2024 to 31 December 2024.

**Common metrics to calculate the carbon dioxide equivalence of greenhouse gases:** This item was first taken up in plenary on [6 November](#). Informal consultations convened, co-facilitated by Camila Labarca Wyneken (Chile) and Marina Vitullo (Italy). On [12 November](#), the SBSTA adopted draft conclusions and a draft decision for the COP, which the COP adopted on [17 November](#).

**SBSTA Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2022/L.25), the SBSTA, *inter alia*, invites the IPCC to present the findings on emission metrics contained in its Sixth Assessment Report at an in-session technical workshop at SBSTA 58 and requests the Secretariat to prepare a technical report as an outcome of the in-session technical workshop.

**COP Decision:** In its decision (FCCC/SBSTA/2022/L.25/Add.1), the COP, *inter alia*:

- decides that, until it adopts a further decision on the matter, the global warming potential values used by parties in their reporting under the Convention to calculate the carbon dioxide equivalence of anthropogenic GHG emissions by sources and removals by sinks shall be based on the effects of GHGs over a 100-year time-horizon as listed in Table 8.A.1 in Appendix 8.A to the contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the IPCC, excluding the value for fossil methane;
- decides that all parties shall start using these global warming potential values no later than on 31 December 2024 for the purpose of meeting their reporting requirements under the Convention;
- decides to consider the need to update these common metric values referred no later than in 2028, concurrently with the review of the modalities, procedures and guidelines of the Enhanced Transparency Framework; and
- decides that each party to the Convention may also use other metrics (e.g., global temperature potential) to report supplemental information on aggregate greenhouse gas emissions and removals, expressed in carbon dioxide equivalent, and that in such case the party shall provide in its reporting under the Convention information on the values of the other metrics used and the IPCC assessment report from which they were sourced.

**Emissions from fuel used for international aviation and maritime transport:** This item was first taken up in plenary on [6 November](#), where the SBSTA noted voluntary reports from the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) and International Maritime Organization (IMO). Informal consultations convened, co-facilitated by Martin Cames (Germany) and Pacifica F. Achieng

Ogola (Kenya) on [11 November](#), where parties debated whether and how to recognize the reports from ICAO and IMO. On [12 November](#), the SBSTA adopted conclusions.

**SBSTA Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2022/L.22), the SBSTA:

- notes that the representatives of the ICAO and IMO Secretariats were present at the informal consultations under this agenda item, were requested to answer parties' questions, and provided some answers on the submissions from ICAO and IMO at the initial informal consultation, and
- agrees to continue consideration of this matter at SBSTA 58.

**Matters Relating to Reporting and Review under Article 13 of the Paris Agreement: Options for conducting reviews on a voluntary basis and respective training courses needed to facilitate these reviews:** This item focused on reviews of information reported pursuant to chapter IV of the annex to Decision 18/CMA.1 (on information related to climate impacts and adaptation) and related reviews and training courses for reviewers. It was first taken up in the SBSTA opening plenary on [6 November](#) and subsequently in SBSTA informal consultations co-facilitated by Julia Gardiner (Australia) and Yamikani Idriss (Malawi). The consultations convened four times, including on [11 November](#).

During the informal consultations, parties agreed on two outstanding issues, namely: that the voluntary review also facilitates the improvement of reporting by identifying, in consultation with the reporting party, areas of improvement and capacity-building needs; and that a training course for reviewers, to be developed by the Secretariat, would also be reviewed in the context of the review of the modalities, procedures, and guidelines for the Enhanced Transparency Framework no later than 2028.

On [12 November](#), the SBSTA adopted conclusions containing a draft decision for consideration and adoption by the CMA. The CMA adopted the decision on [17 November](#).

**CMA Decision:** In its decision (FCCC/SBSTA/2022/L.18), the CMP, *inter alia*:

- decides that a party may, on a voluntary basis, request the Secretariat to organize a review of the information reported by the party pursuant to Decision 18/CMA.1, annex, chapter IV (on climate impacts and adaptation), as part of the technical expert review;
- decides that this voluntary review consists of reviewing information reported in the Biennial Transparency Report and of facilitating the improvement of the reporting by identifying, in consultation with the party, areas of improvement and reporting-related capacity-building needs;
- decides that the outcome of the review should be presented in a dedicated annex to the technical expert review report;
- requests the Secretariat to include on the review team an expert with relevant expertise, to develop and implement a training course for experts participating in the review, and to report on progress in developing the training course the SBSTA;
- undertakes a review of the training course in the context of the review of the modalities, procedures, and guidelines for the Enhanced Transparency Framework no later than 2028 and to consider integrating into the training course relevant outcomes from the GlasS; and
- invites developed country parties to provide financial resources, and encourages other parties to provide financial resources on a

voluntary basis, to enable the development and implementation of the training course in a timely manner.

**Guidance on Cooperative Approaches referred to in Article 6.2:** This item is summarized under the CMA.

**Rules, Modalities and Procedures for the Mechanism established by Article 6.4:** This item is summarized under the CMA.

**Work Programme under the Framework for Non-market Approaches referred to in Article 6.8:** This item is summarized under the CMA.

**Annual Reports on Technical Reviews: Technical review on information reported under the Convention by Annex I parties in their biennial reports and national communications:** The SBSTA took note of the report of the technical review of information ([FCCC/SBSTA/2022/INF.2](#)).

**Technical review of GHG inventories of Annex I parties to the Convention:** The consideration of this item was deferred to SBSTA 58.

**Technical review on GHG inventories and other information reported by Annex I parties, as defined in Article 1.7 of the Kyoto Protocol:** The SBSTA took note of the report of the technical review on GHG inventories ([FCCC/SBSTA/2022/INF.4](#)).

The SBSTA closed on Saturday, 12 November at 11:05 pm.

## SBI/SBSTA

**Report of the Adaptation Committee:** This is summarized under the COP.

**Glasgow-Sharm El-Sheikh Work Programme on the GGA:** This is summarized under the CMA.

**Report of the WIM ExCom:** The WIM ExCom guides the implementation of the functions of the WIM: enhancing understanding and knowledge, strengthening coordination, coherence and synergies, and enhancing action and support, with regard to averting, minimizing and addressing loss and damage. This matter focused on considering the 2022 WIM ExCom report and recommendations. It was first taken up in plenary on [6 November](#), when the WIM ExCom provided an overview of its report (FCCC/SB/2022/2). It was subsequently considered in joint SBI/SBSTA informal consultations, co-facilitated by Cornelia Jäger (Austria) and Lucas di Pietro (Argentina), which convened three times during the first week, including on [8](#) and [9 November](#).

Discussions included whether to: encourage active outreach on technical assistance support already available through the Secretariat and whether this is more appropriately considered in the discussions on the Santiago Network; and request the WIM ExCom to collaborate specifically with the CGE. On the latter, some developed countries cautioned against singling out the CGE, while several developing countries highlighted CGE collaboration as a priority for them.

On [12 November](#), the SBs adopted conclusions containing a draft decision for consideration and adoption by the COP and CMA (FCCC/SB/2022/L.11). On 20 November, the COP and CMA adopted decisions.

**COP/CMA Decisions:** In its decision (FCCC/CP/2022/L.14), the COP endorses the CMA decision on the WIM ExCom's report and notes that considerations related to WIM governance will continue at COP 28 (2023).

In its decision, the CMA (FCCC/PA/CMA/2022/L.12), *inter alia*:

- welcomes the 2022 WIM ExCom report, appreciates the Committee's work, and endorses its recommendations, as well as the Committee's adoption of its second five-year rolling workplan, the second plan of action of the technical expert group on comprehensive risk management, and the third plan of action of the task force on displacement;
- requests the WIM ExCom to continue exploring further opportunities and modalities for engaging national stakeholders, including loss and damage contact points and national focal points and collaborating and enhancing synergies with programmes, bodies, and platforms under and outside the Convention and the Paris Agreement;
- requests the WIM ExCom, with regard to information relating to averting, minimizing and addressing loss and damage, to continue collaborating with the CGE in accordance with the latter's mandate to provide technical advice and support to developing country parties for enhancing their institutional and technical capacity to prepare and submit national reports
- requests the Secretariat to make public the requests it receives for technical assistance and to more actively communicate information on technical assistance available and the ways in which countries may access the technical assistance available, including as relevant to the Santiago Network, and to report on progress to the WIM ExCom; and
- notes that considerations related to WIM governance will continue at CMA 5 (2023).

#### **Matters Relating to the Santiago Network under the WIM:**

This item is summarized under the CMA.

**Matters Relating to the Work Programme for Urgently Scaling Up Mitigation Ambition and Implementation:** This is summarized under the CMA.

**Matters Relating to the Global Stocktake:** This item relates to the ongoing technical phase of the first GST and its political outcome, expected at COP 28. This item was first taken up in plenary on [6 November](#). Parties met in a contact group, co-chaired by Hana Al Hashimi (United Arab Emirates) and Alison Campbell (UK) on [8 November](#).

In the contact group, some countries lamented the lack of time that was allotted for these discussions. They suggested that, if there was more time, a reflection note or other document on the completed technical dialogue events could be possible. Others noted the difficulties in preparing notes while the dialogue is ongoing.

On [12 November](#), the SBs adopted conclusions.

**SB Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SB/2022/L.8), the SBs:

- request the technical dialogue Co-Facilitators to take into account feedback provided by parties at the second meeting of the technical dialogue, and by the joint SBSTA/SBI contact group, when preparing the summary report on the second meeting and designing the third meeting of the technical dialogue;
- request the technical dialogue Co-Facilitators to prepare the summary report on the second meeting of the technical dialogue well in advance of the third meeting and to continue the practice of engaging with parties, noting that the Co-Facilitators are similarly encouraged to engage with non-party stakeholders, after publishing the summary report;
- invite submissions by 15 February 2023 on views on the approach to the consideration of outputs component of the first GST; and

- request the SBSTA and SBI Chairs to hold an intersessional consultation in April 2023 on preparations for the consideration of the outputs component of the first GST and convene an in-session workshop in October 2023 to develop elements for the consideration of outputs component of the first GST, to inform the joint contact group.

**Second periodic review of the long-term global goal under the Convention and of overall progress towards achieving it:** This is summarized under the COP.

**Development and Transfer of Technologies: Joint annual report of the Technology Executive Committee (TEC) and Climate Technology Centre and Network (CTCN):** Under this item, parties considered the report from the two bodies that together make up the Technology Mechanism ([FCCC/SB/2022/4](#)). It was first taken up on [6 November](#), and informal consultations convened, co-facilitated by Stella Gama (Malawi) and Elfriede Anna More (Austria). The Subsidiary Bodies recommended a draft decision, which the COP adopted.

**COP Decision:** In its decision (FCCC/SB/2022/L.12), the COP, *inter alia*:

- invites the TEC and CTCN to jointly pursue collaborative partnerships and strategic engagement with bodies, processes and initiatives under and outside the Convention, including in the private sector, with a view to facilitating the implementation of all activities under the joint work programme;
- invites the TEC and CTCN to strengthen their systematic engagement with national designated entities, including through regional forums for national designated entities, to increase the reach and impact of the work of the Technology Mechanism on policies and practices on the ground;
- invites parties, the TEC and CTCN to explore ways to provide enhanced technical and logistical support to national designated entities, including through collaboration with the public and private sector;
- requests the TEC and CTCN to swiftly finalize the two global rosters of female experts in the area of climate technology and of female and male experts on gender and climate change;
- requests the TEC and CTCN to continue to enhance their efforts to monitor and evaluate the impacts of their work, including identifying new ways to invite feedback from national designated entities on the impact of the work of the Technology Mechanism such as through more practical and effective surveys;
- decides that the TEC shall comprise, in addition to its current membership, one additional member from Annex I parties and one additional member from non-Annex I parties to the Convention that are not represented by the regions Africa, Asia and the Pacific, and Latin America and the Caribbean; and
- notes with concern that securing funding for implementing the mandates of the Technology Mechanism remains an important challenge and encourages the provision of enhanced support to the Technology Mechanism.

In its decision (FCCC/SB/2022/L.16), the CMA, *inter alia*:

- requests the TEC and CTCN to include information in their joint annual reports on activities and actions under the technology framework that have been implemented under the joint work programme;
- notes that the joint annual report does not contain information on how the TEC and CTCN responded to mandates of parties in

the implementation of their work and requests the two bodies to include such information in their joint annual reports; and

- reiterates its concern that the composition of the TEC prevents certain parties from fully participating in its work.

#### **Matters relating to the Forum on the Impact of the**

**Implementation of Response Measures:** This item is summarized under the COP.

**Koronivia Joint Work on Agriculture (KJWA):** The KJWA addresses issues related to agriculture, including through workshops and expert meetings, taking into consideration the vulnerabilities of agriculture to climate change, as well as approaches to addressing food security. This item focuses on considering the next phase of KJWA, including an enhanced joint work programme.

The matter was first taken up in the SB plenary on [6 November](#), and subsequently in joint SBI/SBSTA informal consultations, co-facilitated by Monika Figaj (Poland) and Milagros Sandoval (Peru). Informal consultations convened five times the first week, including on [9 November](#). Unable to reach agreement, further consultations were held during the second week, including on [15](#), [16](#), and [17 November](#).

Discussions included whether the joint work should be open-ended or timebound, and in the latter case, whether it should last three or four years, with the SBs reporting to COP 30 (2025) or COP 31 (2026). Views diverged on whether the workshop topics should already be set at COP 27, with some parties preferring to do so and proposing “food systems” as the first workshop topic. Some of the key issues revolved around including references to mitigation in agriculture, with a developing country calling it unfair for small farmers to take on the burden of mitigation; and whether to recognize that developed countries should take the lead, and that adaptation is an “overriding” or “paramount” priority for vulnerable groups.

On [12 November](#), the SBs adopted conclusions (FCCC/SB/2022/L.9), in which they agreed to recommend that COP 27 consider this item, taking into account the draft texts prepared during the first week.

On 19 November, the COP adopted a decision.

**COP Decision:** In its decision (FCCC/CP/2022/L.4), the COP, *inter alia*:

- urges parties and others to increase their efforts to promote sustainable agriculture, with a view to eradicating hunger and poverty while ensuring food security;
- underscores the importance of constituted bodies and the operating entities of the Financial Mechanism taking into account the conclusions of the subsidiary bodies in implementing their actions and workplans;
- requests the SBSTA and SBI to establish the four-year Sharm El-Sheikh joint work on implementation of climate action on agriculture and food security, including implementation of the KJWA outcomes, recognizing that solutions are context-specific and take into account national circumstances, and the Secretariat to support the joint work;
- invites parties and observers to submit by 27 March 2023 views on the elements of the joint work, including on topics for the workshops, and on the operationalization of the portal, for consideration by SB 58 (June 2023); and
- requests the SBs to report to COP 31 (2026) on the progress and outcomes of the joint work.

#### **Closing Plenary**

Early Sunday morning, 20 November, in his closing remarks, COP President Sameh Shoukry congratulated participants for rising to the challenge and delivering an outcome that will help those who are suffering around the world.

UNFCCC Executive Secretary Simon Stiell said the agreement on funding for loss and damage marks success in a decade-long conversation. He welcomed the mitigation work programme and outcome on adaptation, and said countries have opened the door to transformative action.

Pakistan, for the G-77/CHINA, welcomed the establishment of a loss and damage fund, underscoring it is not charity, but a down payment and investment in climate justice. She expressed regret in the lack of substantive outcomes on the NCQG and GGA and concern with the NAP financing deficit, but welcomed the KCI’s report and the 2023-2027 joint work programme on the Technology Mechanism.

The EU expressed disappointment with the mitigation work programme and the lack of agreement to phase out fossil fuels, despite the support of over 80 countries, and described the agreed language insufficient to address the growing gap between climate science and policy. Limiting climate change, he said, means reducing emissions far more rapidly, not waiting and responding after the effects occur.

Switzerland, for the EIG, said he would submit the group’s statement in writing, in the interest of time.

Australia, for AUSTRALIA, CANADA, JAPAN, ICELAND, ISRAEL, NEW ZEALAND, NORWAY, UK, and US, called the new funding arrangement for loss and damage historic, and welcomed progress made in the Santiago Network’s operationalization and Article 6 (cooperative implementation) guidance. She expressed deep disappointment that some had sought to constrain the ambition of the mitigation work programme.

Zambia, for the AFRICAN GROUP, said the group considered this African COP a pivotal moment to ensure the financial architecture is on track to address climate change. He welcomed the loss and damage fund, just transition work programme, and Article 6 decisions, but lamented the lack of agreement relating to the special needs and circumstances of Africa.

Antigua and Barbuda, for AOSIS, called the loss and damage fund “the start of a new paradigm on climate change.” She urged electing its transitional committee members immediately and ensuring its operationalization by COP 28, saying “this fund must become the lifeboat we need it to be.” She lamented the lack of language on peaking global emissions by 2025 to stay below 1.5°C.

Senegal, for the LDCs, commended the creation of a fund to address loss and damage and urged developed countries to provide financial support to galvanize technical assistance for loss and damage under the Santiago Network. He called for a common definition for climate finance and underscored the need to help LDCs to develop and implement their NAPs.

Saudi Arabia, for the ARAB GROUP, underscored: activating the principle of CBDR; addressing emissions and not their origin, calling for using all available technologies; and lamented the failure to conclude the midterm review of the response measures forum.

Bolivia, for the LMDCs, welcomed the decision on the loss and damage fund, but expressed concern on efforts to dilute CBDR and question equity, including attempts to expand the donor base and shift developed countries’ responsibilities to the private sector. He

enquired where the means of implementation support for developing countries to stay below 1.5°C is, and called for moving away from rhetoric and remaining true to the spirit of ambition.

Venezuela, for the BOLIVARIAN ALLIANCE FOR THE PEOPLES OF OUR AMERICA (ALBA), said the group worked hard in defense of CBDR, equity, rights of Mother Earth, and the right to development. Welcoming the loss and damage fund, she said everything hinges on the fund “not falling in the black hole where the USD 100 billion commitment fell.”

Colombia, for AILAC, recalled UN General Assembly resolution 76/300 on the human right to a clean, healthy and sustainable environment, and stressed the importance of: abandoning fossil fuels; all countries taking efforts to limit global warming to 1.5°C; establishing the loss and damage fund; and progressing on institutional arrangements for the Santiago Network.

Papua New Guinea, for the COALITION FOR RAINFOREST NATIONS, called for recognizing the role of forests and the land use sector in aligning with 1.5°C pathways. He called for new, additional and predictable resource-based finance from a wide variety of sources, and said eligible activities under Paris Agreement Article 5.2 (forests) should be included under Article 6 (cooperative implementation).

LOCAL GOVERNMENTS AND MUNICIPAL AUTHORITIES said the group had come to COP 27 to demonstrate cities and regions are driving force of climate action on the ground, and expressed gratitude for the organization of the first ministerial meeting on urbanization and climate change, calling for this to become a standing item.

WOMEN AND GENDER celebrated the leadership of developing countries, grassroots movements, and civil society in pushing forward the loss and damage fund, and expressed frustration over a rollback on normative language on gender equality and human rights in decisions at COP 27.

CHILDREN AND YOUTH called for funds for loss and damage to be mobilized and delivered transparently and urgently to support those in need. They lamented parties’ failure to include language on phaseout of fossil fuels and more stringent language on environmental integrity and human rights under Article 6.

Saying businesses stand behind 1.5°C and recognize their key role in achieving it, BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY NGOs said COP 27 “held the Glasgow line” but could have achieved more. She commended progress made on Article 6 and called on enabling markets to deliver results and finance as soon as possible.

CLIMATE ACTION NETWORK thanked civil society organizations worldwide for keeping sustained pressure on rich nations to take responsibility, and the G-77/China for remaining united behind the demand to create a loss and damage fund at COP 27. Lamenting COP 27’s failure to commit to phasing out fossil fuels, she urged a rapid, just, and equitable transition to renewable energy.

INDIGENOUS PEOPLES lamented that the urgency and hope heard in the first week was quickly overshadowed by false solutions that do not reduce emissions at source, including reliance on carbon markets, calling these a new form of climate colonialism.

TRADE UNION NGOs welcomed progress at COP 27 on social dialogue and protection, expressed concern that human and labor rights are sidelined, and called for a just transition of the workforce

to be embedded in every workstream. Describing the failure to agree on fossil fuel phase-out devastating, he queried how much longer profits will be put before people and planet.

COP President Shoukry gavelled the COP, CMA, and CMP to a close at 9:19 am on Sunday, 20 November.

## A Brief Analysis of COP 27

*“Decide if you are rich and powerful to help the ones suffering the most. Please do not leave our communities exposed and hit. Show us your courage, be our heroes. When is now, if not today.”* – Nakeeyat Dramani Sam, Ghanaian youth climate activist

In 2012, in the aftermath of a devastating typhoon, a climate negotiator from the Philippines implored the plenary of Doha Climate Change Conference: “If not us, then who? If not now, then when? If not here, then where?” In the final days of COP 27, a ten-year-old youth ambassador from Ghana received a standing ovation after a passionate speech about her country’s plight amid heavy flooding. The obvious parallels made many wonder how much progress had been made over the past decade in protecting the vulnerable on the frontlines of climate change—or minimizing the risks of loss and damage in the first place.

COP 27 was expected to be one of “implementation.” On the opening day, new UNFCCC Executive Secretary Simon Stiell called for aligning “every corner of human activity” with the 1.5°C goal, saying “Paris gave us the agreement and Katowice and Glasgow gave us the plan, Sharm El-Sheikh shifts us to implementation.”

However, two things complicated fulfilling this task: 2022 has been a year of “permacrisis,” with rising energy and food prices, prolonged impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic, economic slowdowns, and, not least, geopolitical tensions. Combined, these made the prospects of reducing emissions and providing the necessary climate finance to meet the 1.5°C goal in the short term seem difficult. But perhaps an even bigger challenge was that countries still hold widely different views on what implementation entails in the Paris Agreement era.

During the closing plenary, parties agreed that the major achievement of this COP was the establishment of a dedicated fund for loss and damage. They, however, had mixed evaluations of how well the broader outcomes demonstrate resolve on implementation and higher ambition. Rather than keeping “1.5 alive,” some worried this could be the COP where it died. This brief analysis evaluates how and whether COP 27 succeeded in making the necessary shift to implementation by asking three questions: implementation of what, implementation for whom, and implementation when?

### Implementation of What?

The Sharm El-Sheikh Climate Change Conference had the difficult task of shifting from regime building and ambition raising to the seemingly more mundane (but critical) task of climate action and delivery of support. With the Paris Agreement rulebook complete and new emission targets tabled in Glasgow in 2021, COP 27 was expected to focus on enabling implementation. On the list were continuing work programmes on mitigation ambition and implementation and on the Global Goal on Adaptation agreed at COP 26 in Glasgow. But there was also something new in the shape of growing calls from developing countries to establish a loss and

damage finance facility at this COP. Developed countries' failure to deliver on their USD 100 billion climate finance pledge from Copenhagen in 2009 continued to undermine trust.

Paris Agreement parties generally agree on the main pillars of its implementation: action on mitigation and adaptation and support for developing countries through finance and other "means of implementation." Loss and damage has gained increasing visibility and traction in recent years, with climate disasters wreaking havoc worldwide.

For many countries, enabling accelerated emissions cuts, building on COP 26's call to "keep 1.5 alive" remains the foremost priority. This includes most developed countries, the Environmental Integrity Group, and some of the world's most vulnerable countries, including the least developed countries (LDCs) and the Alliance of Small Island Developing States (AOSIS), along with the Independent Association for Latin America and the Caribbean (AILAC), which see going beyond 1.5°C as an existential threat.

Several high- and middle-income developing countries and major emerging economies, coalescing under the Like-minded Group of Developing Countries (LDMCs), in turn, believe they are increasingly under pressure to further reduce their emissions. They maintain that the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities, enshrined in the Convention in 1992, which requires developed countries to take the lead in climate action and support, continues to apply, yet they are increasingly being asked to shoulder a burden wrought by the lack of developed countries' action.

At COP 27, this view was particularly visible during the discussions on the "Work programme to urgently scale up mitigation ambition and implementation in this critical decade," established at COP 26. Here, the final outcome clarifies that this work programme will be "non-prescriptive, non-punitive, facilitative, respectful of national sovereignty, ... and will not impose new targets or goals." For this group, the other Paris Agreement pillars are equally important as mitigation, and they point out that developing countries' priorities, including adaptation and finance, continue to be insufficiently addressed.

Held on African soil, many were expecting COP 27 to have a pronounced focus on adaptation and finance, which are priority issues for the continent. While discussions on the Global Goal on Adaptation—an aspirational goal set in the Paris Agreement, which countries are now working to specify—received attention, they also proved difficult and continued until the final hours of the COP. Some long-term adaptation experts believed the issue did not get the attention it deserved, with one lamenting that "just when it began getting momentum, money and talent are now going to loss and damage." To many, the only new, tangible outcome on adaptation was the decision to "initiate the development of a framework," to be adopted next year, which will guide the Global Goal on Adaptation work programme. A core part of the work programme itself involves enhancing understanding of what the goal actually means and how to measure progress towards achieving it. Adaptation needs can be very local and qualitative, posing challenges to aggregate efforts under a global goal.

Finance was expected to be another big-ticket item in Sharm El-Sheikh, with the various bodies' agendas boasting a total of 18 climate finance-related items. Among the most contentious of these were issues related to tracking the delivery of developed countries' USD 100 billion by 2020 pledge, which even the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) suggested

had been missed by USD 17 billion, and a pledge from Glasgow to double adaptation finance provision from 2019 levels by 2025.

At the same time, developed countries are keen to expand the pool of climate finance contributors to include the private sector, philanthropies, charitable sources, development banks, and even some developing countries. While new climate finance pledges made during COPs have often helped sweeten the deal, the tally from COP 27 was somewhat meagre. The Adaptation Fund attracted USD 230 million in new pledges, and initial promises for the new Global Shield climate risk insurance scheme totaled EUR 210 million.

The overarching cover decisions from COP 27, titled the Sharm El-Sheikh Implementation Plan, compile some of the conference's main outcomes and provide additional political messages. They epitomize the difficulty of reconciling these different visions of implementation. The cover decisions, which were adopted in the early morning hours of Sunday, 20 November, strike a balance that was agreeable to all but also left everyone equally dissatisfied.

During the closing plenary, many groups and countries pointed out that the texts did not go beyond Glasgow in demonstrating higher ambition, which in their view, would have included references to peaking of global emissions by 2025 and phasing down all fossil fuels, not just coal. Others, in turn, were more concerned about the "erosion" of equity and common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities and argued rhetoric around ambition was used to disguise a lack of appetite to provide support to developing countries.

### *Implementation for Whom?*

The presence of 112 world leaders at the Sharm El-Sheikh Climate Implementation Summit during the first week may have created an impression that the majority of countries were serious about implementation. However, with many other policy priorities competing for their attention, leaders made few new, transformative announcements. "Implementation is not as sexy as ambition," pointed out one delegate, who also noted that expecting major progress in implementation only one year after the full operationalization of the Paris rulebook was premature.

With scarce financial resources available in the short term, the focus turned to who should be prioritized in its delivery. Long-standing calls by the African Group for its special needs and circumstances to be discussed under a separate agenda item were again stymied by calls from other developing regions to be similarly recognized for their specific needs and priorities. In the cover decisions, Africa only receives two brief references.

Loss and damage, which affects the most vulnerable countries and communities, has been a priority for small island developing states since the 1990s. Developed countries have traditionally resisted calls for specific loss and damage funding, partly in fear of related liability and compensation calls that might ensue given their responsibility for most historical emissions. The decision that adopted the Paris Agreement in 2015 (in)famously states that the article on loss and damage does not include liability or compensation.

At COP 27, this caveat against construing any funding as liability or compensation was carefully included as a footnote in the agenda, a compromise that made it possible to finally have an agenda item on funding arrangements for loss and damage—a dedicated space in the formal negotiations to discuss this matter. The need for specific funding arrangements has, over the years, received

all developing countries' support. At COP 27, an agreement was finally reached to establish a dedicated fund for responding to, and addressing, loss and damage, along with a transitional committee to work out the details and identify opportunities and gaps so it can be operationalized at COP 28 in 2023.

In Sharm El-Sheikh, some developed countries insisted they would only support such a fund if it focused on the most vulnerable countries and had financing coming from a broader donor base. Many interpreted this as a requirement for emerging economies like China to also contribute. Part of the final compromise appears to have been a qualifier that the new loss and damage funding arrangements would be for "assisting developing countries that are particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change," but without specifying which countries these would be. The decision does not identify who would be providing the financing, but simply notes the resources would be "new and additional" and "complement and include sources, funds, processes and initiatives under and outside the Convention and the Paris Agreement." The conversation is not over, however, as the decision also calls for recommendations on expanding sources of funding.

Another major driving force for the loss and damage fund was civil society, which rallied behind the call for the fund, and for climate justice and equity more broadly. Implementation, they stressed, cannot cause harm to the most vulnerable. This point was raised most often in conversations on gender and carbon markets under Paris Agreement Article 6. The Article 6 negotiations continued quietly in the background over the two-week COP and managed to deliver a significant amount of guidance that will help operationalize and scale up international cooperation on market and non-market approaches to reduce emissions, support adaptation, and promote sustainable development.

Civil society followed these discussions closely, intervening where they felt environmental and social safeguards and human and Indigenous Peoples' rights were not upheld. This included the area of removals, which refers to extracting emissions from the atmosphere through natural or technological means to help countries reach net-zero emissions. In the final decision, guidance on removals, an initial draft of which civil society believed was vague and lacked critical safeguards and rights provisions, was given back to the Article 6.4 market mechanism's Supervisory Body for further work. Still, observers were left unhappy with what they described as an absence of "references to the need for any market to contribute to overall ambition and the imperative to respect and protect human rights." A win for climate activists, however, was an indirect reference in the cover decisions to UN General Assembly resolution 76/300 from 2022, on the human right to a clean, healthy, and sustainable environment.

### **Implementation When?**

COP 27 undeniably marked a historic milestone for addressing loss and damage. It also, quoting COP 26 President Alok Sharma, "held the line" on 1.5°C, even if it still "remains on life support." The conference also delivered substantive decisions in major areas crucial for implementation, including mitigation, adaptation, finance and markets, but left many asking the important question of when these different elements of climate action would be delivered upon.

While references to science and urgency feature in the mitigation work programme decision, some developing countries, particularly the LMDCs, felt the item might introduce new elements beyond

the Paris mandate, such as medium-term targets, and preferred to conclude the work programme in 2023 instead of continuing through 2030. As a compromise, the work programme now only has a mandate through 2026. Similarly, a call for reflecting new findings from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change on the need to peak global emissions before 2025 to limit warming to 1.5°C did not make it into the final cover decisions.

Similar temporal divergence in views was present in the discussions on finance, where developing countries underscored the urgency of first having clarity on the "quantum" and time frame of the new, post-2025 collective quantitative goal on climate finance, and discussing the specifics afterwards. Developed countries continued to insist on discussing technical aspects first, and then agreeing on a numerical target in 2024. The decision adopted on this item by the Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement delivers little for the developing countries in this regard.

On balance, COP 27 outcomes will likely suffice to keep implementation on track for another year, and they certainly delivered a major win to those already suffering the devastating impacts of climate change. But much more needs to be done. As expressed by UN Secretary-General António Guterres, "COP 27 concludes with much homework and little time."

During the closing plenary on Sunday, 20 November, many groups and countries had already set their eyes on COP 28. The next COP, which will be held in the United Arab Emirates, carries the hope that it will propel more on both implementation and ambition through the first Global Stocktake. The Paris Agreement is in implementation mode, although it is clear that countries hold very different views on how to enable ambitious implementation. COPs will need to reinvent themselves as places where countries convene to demonstrate progress, uphold transparency and accountability, and raise ambition to the levels required to avert a climate crisis. While many are asking if COPs are fit for purpose, few offer answers of what should change. As one observer put it, "if we didn't have COPs, we'd have to invent them," especially to provide space for the most vulnerable to urge action on their priorities under the Paris Agreement. How the different visions of implementation and raising ambition will play out at future COPs is a question that remains and needs an urgent answer.

## **Upcoming Meetings**

### **63rd meeting of the Global Environment Facility (GEF)**

**Council:** GEF 63 will be the first Council Meeting under the GEF's eighth replenishment. The UNFCCC invited the GEF to consider a number of issues emerging from COP 27, including additional funding for adaptation. **dates:** 28 November – 2 December 2022 **location:** virtual **www:** [thegef.org/events/63rd-gef-council-meeting](https://thegef.org/events/63rd-gef-council-meeting)

**UN Biodiversity Conference (CBD COP 15):** This meeting includes the 15th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (COP) to the CBD, the 10th meeting of the COP serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, and the 4th meeting of the COP serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit-sharing. The meetings are scheduled to take place to review the achievement and delivery of the CBD's Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. It is also expected to take a final decision on the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, as well as decisions on related topics, including capacity building and



resource mobilization. It will be preceded by the fifth meeting of the Open-ended Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework on 3-5 December. **dates:** 7-19 December 2022

**location:** Montreal, Canada **www:** [cbd.int/conferences/2021-2022](http://cbd.int/conferences/2021-2022)

#### 58th session of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate

**Change:** IPCC 58 is expected to focus on the approval of the Synthesis Report (SYR) of the Sixth Assessment Report (AR6), which will be the last of the AR6 products. **dates:** 13-17 March 2023 (TBC) **location:** Interlaken, Switzerland (TBC) **www:** [ipcc.ch](http://ipcc.ch)

#### 2023 Spring Meetings of the World Bank Group and the

**International Monetary Fund (IMF):** The World Bank and IMF, as well as related ancillary events, will take up various topics, including invitations from the UNFCCC COP to consider outcomes from COP 27. **dates:** 14-16 April 2023 **location:** Washington, D.C., US **www:** [worldbank.org/en/meetings/splash/about#sec2](http://worldbank.org/en/meetings/splash/about#sec2)

#### High-Level Meeting of the General Assembly on the

**Midterm Review of the Implementation of the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) 2015-2030:** This meeting will mark the conclusion of the Midterm Review. The High-Level Meeting will adopt a concise and action-oriented political declaration to renew commitments and accelerate the implementation of the Sendai Framework. The declaration will feed into several UN processes, including UNFCCC COP 28. **dates:** 18-19 May 2023 **location:** UN Headquarters, New York **www:** [globalplatform.undrr.org/conference-event/midterm-review-plenary-2-beyond-natural-hazards-operationalising-expanded-scope](http://globalplatform.undrr.org/conference-event/midterm-review-plenary-2-beyond-natural-hazards-operationalising-expanded-scope)

#### 58th sessions of the UNFCCC Subsidiary Body for

**Implementation (SBI) and Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA):** SBSTA and SBI will meet for their regular intersessional gatherings, taking up a range of issues, including follow up from COP 27. **dates:** 5-15 June 2023 **location:** Bonn, Germany **www:** [unfccc.int/conference/first-sessional-period-2023](http://unfccc.int/conference/first-sessional-period-2023)

#### 35th Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol on

**Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer (MOP 35):** This meeting will discuss issues related to the implementation of the Montreal Protocol. **dates:** 23-27 October 2023 **location:** Nairobi, Kenya (tentative) **www:** [ozone.unep.org/meetings/thirty-fifth-meeting-parties](http://ozone.unep.org/meetings/thirty-fifth-meeting-parties)

**UNFCCC COP 28:** The 28th session of the Conference of the Parties (COP 28), the 18th meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP 18), and the fifth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement (CMA 5) will convene. **dates:** 30 November-12 December 2023 **location:** Dubai, United Arab Emirates **www:** [unfccc.int/](http://unfccc.int/)

For additional meetings, visit [sdg.iisd.org](http://sdg.iisd.org)

## Glossary

AILAC	Independent Association for Latin America and the Caribbean
AOSIS	Alliance of Small Island States
CBDR	Common but differentiated responsibilities
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CERs	Certified emission reductions
CGE	Consultative Group of Experts
CMA	Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement
CMP	Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol
COP	Conference of the Parties
CTCN	Climate Technology Centre and Network
EIG	Environmental Integrity Group
GCF	Green Climate Fund
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GGA	Global goal on adaptation
GHGs	Greenhouse gases
GlaSS	Glasgow-Sharm El- Sheikh work programme on the global goal on adaptation
GST	Global Stocktake
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
KCI	Katowice Committee of Experts on the Impacts of the Implementation of Response Measures
LDCs	Least developed countries
LEG	LDC Expert Group
LMDC	Like-Minded Group of Developing Countries
MDBs	Multilateral development banks
NAPs	National adaptation plans
NDCs	Nationally determined contributions
NCQG	New collective quantified goal on climate finance
OMGE	Overall mitigation in global emissions
SBI	Subsidiary Body for Implementation
SBs	Subsidiary Bodies
SBSTA	Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice
SCF	Standing Committee on Finance
SIDS	Small island developing states
TEC	Technology Executive Committee
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
WIM	Warsaw International Mechanism for Loss and Damage associated with Climate Change Impacts