



COP28 – The Outcome

A quick overview of the results at COP28

By Gunnar Boye Olesen, International Network for Sustainable Energy (INFORSE),

December 13, 2023

The UNFCCC COP28 ended this morning, after a long night of overtime negotiations. The results are opening a series of problems, but also hope.

On the **positive side**, the countries:

- Agreed to establish a fund for loss & damage,
- Called on each other to transition away from fossil fuels in energy systems in a just, orderly, and equitable manner, accelerating action in this decade to achieve net zero by 2050.
- Called on each other to triple renewable energy capacity and doubling the implementation of energy efficiency until 2030.
- Called on each other to accelerate the reduction of emissions from road transport.
- Encouraged efforts to transition to sustainable lifestyles and sustainable patterns of consumption and production.
- Decided to establish a technology implementation programme (details to be developed later)
- Agreed a programme for just and equitable transitions, including energy, socioeconomic, workforce and other dimensions, also including emphasis on opportunities, challenges and barriers relating to sustainable development and poverty eradication as part of the transitions.
- Recognised the urgency of climate change and agreed other issues, including on the way forward

On the **negative side**, the countries:

- Called on each other to accelerate, inter alia, renewables, nuclear, abatement and removal technologies such as carbon capture and utilization and storage (CCUS), and low-carbon hydrogen production.
 When equivalencing the fast and safe renewable energy with the slow and risky nuclear energy and other problematic solutions; the gate got wide open for these solutions as climate solutions and maybe for climate financing. If used for climate mitigation, these solutions will slow down climate action and make the transition more expensive. More nuclear power will increase nuclear waste and increase risks of radioactive pollution from the nuclear fuel chain, from accidents, from terrorist attacks etc. CCUS is also expensive and has its own set of risks with CO₂ spills etc.
- Called on each other to accelerate efforts globally towards net zero emission energy systems with zero- and low-carbon fuels well before or by around mid-century. With this, countries are inviting each other to use fossil gas, unsustainable biomass, and other “low carbon” fuels until past 2050.
- Did not provide larger financial climate support, with support for the new loss & damage fund (US\$ 792 million) and the Adaptation Fund (US\$ 188 million) well below expectations and no promises of substantial increase in financial climate support (a new target for climate finance to be agreed next year).
- Did not agree a call to move the investments from black to green (included in Paris Agreement objective, art. 2.1c).
- Made a weak agreement on the Global Goal of Adaptation that was promised in 2015 with the Paris Agreement
- Agreed a weak mitigation work program with only a framework for dialogues in 2024, no action.
- Emphasized a need for voluntary cooperation, where one country is paying to another country instead of reducing emissions. This will compromise climate action with rich countries being able to pay instead of reducing emissions.

This quick and early analysis is based on the outcome of the UNFCCC COP28, including “*Outcome of the first global stocktake*”, “*Work programme on just transition pathways*”, decision on Global Goal on Adaptation, “*Sharm el-Sheikh mitigation ambition and implementation work programme*”, available at <https://unfccc.int/documents> .