



## **SB60 EXIT PRESS STATEMENT**

**Bonn, Germany; June 11, 2024**

We are here, once again, to convey our views on SB60, as representatives of broad constituencies drawn from the African continent. Here, we represent Africa in its diversity, including civil society, Women, youth, Parliamentarians, Indigenous People & Local Communities, smallholder producers, pastoralists, Scholars and others.

We came to Bonn with renewed hope that the New Collective Quantified Goal (NCQG) discussions will be honest and frank with all parties committed to seeing that the NCQG will be based on the priorities and needs of developing country and support country-driven strategies, with a focus on Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) and National Adaptation Plans (NAPs).

We came to Bonn with the hope that seeing the devastation climate change is visiting our countries and people, the rich countries will be eager and willing to indicate the Quantum as per article 9.5 of the Paris Agreement to allow developing countries to plan their climate action. But the hopes have faded, and we are worried about the apparent conversion of negotiations to endless workshops, which we believe are delaying tactics.

SB60 is crucial in sending positive signals on whether we will have a successful COP29, or it will end up as another annual ritual, another talk-shop adding to the pile of decisions and declarations which remain unimplemented, only to wait for another COP for another round of negotiations. We have perfected the art of semantics and taking hardline positions on a grave matter which is catching up with all of us, irrespective of our geographical locations.

The desire of all of us – parties and Non-Parties delegates – is to see COP29 as a climate finance COP, to reflect on the urgency in addressing the ever-elusive question of financing climate action. Could this be slipping away? There are forces within this SB60 who could be scheming a different theme, to, once again, divert attention on climate finance and relegate the subject to the periphery. We should emphatically say NO. Climate finance is the biggest elephant in the room, and however long it takes to deal with it, we should understand that it will never go away.

We are appalled that the negotiations on (NCQG) started on a wrong trajectory with Loss and Damage being pushed out of the agenda justifying with lame excuse that it is not necessarily specified under article 9.1 of the Paris Agreement. This assertion points to a deliberate effort by countries from the north to interpret Article 9 of the Paris Agreement in a manner that is convenient to them without referring to provisions of Article 4 of the UNFCCC convention which is clear on the obligation of developed countries parties to provide adequate finance to the developing countries as opposed to the language of “mobilisation” of resources.

The new semantic, “mobilization of financial resources” is merely privatization of climate finance within NCQG, thus surrendering poor countries to climate-debt speculators, further impoverishing countries clutching from debts. This market-based approach helps developed countries to escape their obligations on the provision of climate finance as per the Convention and Paris Agreement.

Similarly, the negotiations on the global goal on adaptation (GGA) are focusing more on the indicators while the main enabler of this agenda, which is the means of implementation, is being vehemently fought by the parties from the developed countries. Without clear indications on the means of implementation, GGA is an empty shell and it is not fit for purpose. Adaptation must be funded from public resources and must not be seen as a business opportunity open to private sector players.

We also wish to state that we will never relent in our demand for affirmation of Africa as a” special needs and circumstances for the region”. And we urge the AGN, despite frustrations, never to give us on this crucial status which differentiates us from others, backed by science and imperatives of climate justice. We express our deep concerns about the current negotiation on NAPs which features “special circumstances for least developed countries (LDC) and Small Island States”, attempting to amend the provisions of Article 4 1e of the UNFCCC convention. This, once again, is an injustice for Africa and its people.

As we conclude the SB60, we call on Parties to close ranks on NCQG, GGA and L&D. As we reiterated during our opening statement last week:

1. We find no basis for these negotiations, at SB60 and also during the COP29, if the NCQG does not address the priority needs of communities at the frontline of the climate crisis by providing funds for adaptation and loss and damage. NCQG must take into account critical adaptation and Loss& damage needs of the vulnerable communities in Africa and other developing nations. It must encompass financial projections for undertaking actions in the spheres of adaptation, loss and damage, mitigation and just transition in supporting developing countries to transition to low carbon development pathway.
2. The means of implementation must feature prominently in the GGA negotiation since the targets identified are useless if not coupled with resources to support the attainment of the same. We warn against concerted efforts by the rich countries to push the work on the development of indicators to the Adaptation Committee. While we appreciate the crucial role the AC plays in the adaptation agenda, we assert the AGN position that the work on indicators is too sensitive to be left in the hands of AC. We call for a Party-driven process and preferably an Ad Hoc Working Group to ensure we have context-based indicators that align with the realities of local communities, Indigenous people, youth and marginalised communities to guide financial projections for the finance goal.
3. The National Adaptation Plans (NAPS) are crucial vehicles through which countries chart their priority actions. We are concerned by the stringent processes put in place which hinder developing countries from accessing support for the development of the NAPs, as it were, less than 50% of countries in Africa have accessed the funds leave alone accessing financial support for implementation of the same.
4. We are disturbed by the proposal coming from rich countries to push the burden of implementation of NAPs to developing countries through domestic resource mobilisation. It is worth noting that these developing countries, particularly Africa, are already paying the cost

of adaptation dearly. We assert that NAPs must be funded through public finance from the high polluter countries and that their implementation must not be privatised.

5. We are profoundly alarmed by the numerous attempts to tamper with the Paris Agreement. The attempt to move agenda items from COP to CMA must be avoided at all costs. SB60 is marred by systematic attempts to move items like the review of the Adaptation Committee (AC) from COP to CMA even though there exists a decision from Glasgow that clearly states that AC review is supposed to be conducted by COP with the participation of CMA; Similarly, there is a concerted effort to push the gender agenda item to CMA which is unacceptable. We retaliate that the provision of the convention and CMA must be read together and that there should be no attempt to use CMA as a soft-landing bay to frustrate efforts by developing countries parties
6. Finally, we assert that parties under the UNFCCC must embrace the principle of inclusivity in line with the doctrine of procedural justice in regard to visa approvals for developing country parties. The delegates from Africa experienced serious challenges in visa approval to attend SB60 and there are fears that a similar obstacle may be experienced in Baku. Denying delegates from developing countries visas to attend these important conferences is tantamount to sealing their fate and this unacceptable