

Compilation and synthesis of submissions on the Glasgow–Sharm el-Sheikh work programme on the global goal on adaptation

5 June 2022

I. Introduction

A. Background

1. The Paris Agreement, in its Article 7.1, established the global goal on adaptation (GGA) of enhancing adaptive capacity, strengthening resilience and reducing vulnerability to climate change, with a view to contributing to sustainable development and ensuring an adequate adaptation response in the context of the temperature goal referred to in Article 2 of the Agreement. The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement (CMA) decided, at its third session, to establish and launch a comprehensive two-year Glasgow–Sharm el-Sheikh work programme on the global goal on adaptation to start immediately after CMA 3 and be carried out jointly by the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA) and the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI) (decision 7/CMA.3).¹

2. The objectives of the work programme should be to, inter alia:

(a) Enable the full and sustained implementation of the Paris Agreement, towards achieving the global goal on adaptation, with a view to enhancing adaptation action and support;

(b) Enhance understanding of the global goal on adaptation, including of the methodologies, indicators, data and metrics, needs and support needed for assessing progress towards it;

(c) Contribute to reviewing the overall progress made in achieving the global goal on adaptation as part of the global stocktake referred to in Article 7, paragraph 14, and Article 14 of the Paris Agreement with a view to informing the first and subsequent global stocktakes (GST);

(d) Enhance national planning and implementation of adaptation actions through the process to formulate and implement national adaptation plans and through nationally determined contributions and adaptation communications;

(e) Enable Parties to better communicate their adaptation priorities, implementation and support needs, plans and actions, including through adaptation communications and nationally determined contributions;

(f) Facilitate the establishment of robust, nationally appropriate systems for monitoring and evaluating adaptation actions;

(g) Strengthen implementation of adaptation actions in vulnerable developing countries;

(h) Enhance understanding of how communication and reporting instruments established under the Convention and the Paris Agreement related to adaptation can complement each other in order to avoid duplication of efforts.

3. To inform the work programme, Parties were invited to submit by 30 April 2022 views on how to achieve the objectives under the work programme, based on which the SB

¹ <https://unfccc.int/documents/460952>

Chairs were invited to select themes for the workshops. The secretariat was requested to prepare, under the guidance of the SB Chairs a compilation and synthesis of those submissions for consideration at the workshops.

B. Overview of submissions and scope of the compilation and synthesis

4. As of 4 June 2022, a total of 21 submissions from Groups of Parties and Parties² have been made on how to achieve the objectives of the work programme.³ In addition, several Parties shared national experiences and good practices in undertaking adaptation action and providing support.

5. The compilation and synthesis summarizes the views of Parties along their expected outcomes of the work programme; on the objectives of the work programme and on the operational design of the GGA work programme.

6. In addition, nine voluntary submissions⁴ were received from non-Party stakeholders.⁵ These submissions are only reflected in the section on views on the objectives to inform deliberations at the workshops.

II. Views on expected outcomes of the GGA work programme

7. Most Parties expect the work programme to create a common understanding of the GGA, how to conceptualize it and thereafter assess progress towards achieving it. Many expressed their hope that, over time, the global community will be able to understand the ‘direction of travel’ on adaptation action, and understand the required efforts, including technical, financial, technological and capacity-building efforts, in order to meet the adaptation challenges posed by the committed climate change impacts as well as those projected impacts in light of current mitigation ambitions. For some, the work programme is expected to re-establish the link between adaptation and mitigation, in an inclusive and dynamic manner, keeping mitigation and adaptation actions on a well-balanced track towards achieving global climate goals.

8. Many Parties also expect the work programme to contribute substantially to enhancing adaptation action and support, in particular finance, as well as raising mitigation ambition so as to prevent and reduce future needs for adaptation. In this regard, several Parties highlighted the urgent transformation societies must go through whilst bearing in mind the needs of *Mother Earth* and the provision of additional and predictable finance, capacity-building, and technology development and transfer to support climate adaptation in developing countries in line with existing commitments under the Convention and the Paris Agreement.

9. Several Parties see the GGA work programme as an important platform for the full exchange of relevant good practices, methods, tools and experiences at the national, regional and global levels on planning, implementing, monitoring and assessing adaptation action and

² Antigua and Barbuda on behalf of on behalf of the Alliance of Small Island States, Argentina on behalf of Argentina, Brazil and Uruguay, Australia, Canada, Chile on behalf of the Independent Association of Latin America and the Caribbean, China, European Union, Japan, Indonesia, Kenya, Kuwait on behalf of the Arab Group, Maldives, New Zealand, Norway, Saudi Arabia on behalf of the Like-Minded Developing countries, Senegal on behalf of the Least Developed Countries, Singapore, South Africa, USA, Vanuatu, and Zambia on behalf of the African Group of Negotiators on Climate Change.

³ <https://www4.unfccc.int/sites/submissionsstaging/Pages/Home.aspx> enter “global goal on adaptation” in the search field.

⁴ Adaptation Research Alliance, Asabe Shehu Yar'adua Foundation, Climate Action Network International, Coalition of organizations from the international water community, Environmental Defense Fund, Stockholm Environment Institute, The Nature Conservancy and Conservation International, United Nations University and World Wildlife Fund.

⁵ <https://www4.unfccc.int/sites/submissionsstaging/Pages/Home.aspx> enter “sb 56” in the search field.

support. For some, the work programme should produce a comprehensive collection of national and local examples of effective adaptation planning and implementation and should help practitioners to find the tools and information needed to act on their plans.

10. In terms of expected outcomes at national level, some expect Parties to have the capacity and resources to monitor and evaluate progress on adaptation actions, and to use this work programme as an opportunity to take stock of their own national adaptation goals, current approaches for monitoring and evaluation and associated indicators.

11. Regarding indicators for tracking adaptation progress, many Parties do not envision the development of top-down or prescriptive approaches for assessing progress towards the GGA while one Party expects the work programme to develop high level overarching global indicators which should be linked with national sector specific indicators.

12. Many Parties expect the work programme to result in streamlined communication and reporting on adaptation needs, actions and progress for improved efficiency and a better understanding of how communication and reporting instruments under the Convention and the Paris Agreement related to adaptation can complement each other.

13. Most Parties expect the GGA work programme to meaningfully contribute to the GST by showing how adaptation progress can be reviewed and assessed through multiple, complementary approaches that are informed by data and good practice and are context-specific and not overly burdensome.

14. Some Parties propose to already have a substantive outcome at CMA 4, for example on approaches and principles that will be applied to reviewing progress towards the GGA in the first GST. One Party recommends the transformation of the GGA work programme from a time-bound process to a dynamic and living mechanism.

III. Views on the objectives of the GGA work programme

A. Enable the full and sustained implementation of the Paris Agreement with a view to enhancing adaptation action and support

15. For many, this objective is overarching and should guide the consideration of the other objective. Many Parties underlined that adaptation is an iterative and dynamic process that is context-sensitive and based on local and regional specificities, priorities, options and needs, and that adaptation options and needs are diverse and manifold, as are exposure, vulnerability and hazards of climate change.

16. According to many, adaptation and its consideration in the GGA work programme needs to be country-driven and context-specific, and should follow a bottom-up approach. Several Parties highlighted the priority of social inclusion, empowering the most vulnerable, including women, youth, indigenous peoples and those with disabilities, and the need for gender-responsive and human rights-based approaches, with a view to ensuring sustained and inclusive economic growth, social development, environmental protection and the eradication of poverty and hunger in the context of sustainable development.

17. Many Parties called for the consideration of sustainable development and mitigation synergies and co-benefits in the context of the GGA work programme by linking to other ongoing global action-oriented and locally driven processes, programmes and coalitions contributing to sustainable development and poverty eradication, e.g. Agenda 2030 and the upcoming Post-2020 Biodiversity Framework. According to several Parties, adaptation approaches promoted under the GGA work programme need to minimise trade-offs, strengthen synergies, avoid maladaptation and enhance integration of risk and resilience thinking into all relevant decisions, policies, and investments. One submission proposed for the GGA work programme to further develop guidance/criteria for ‘climate-resilient

development' that drives adaptation (and mitigation) actions to address the current and future climate impacts and risks to people and nature.

18. Several Parties call on collective adaptation work to move from the current incremental efforts towards transformational adaptation in order to drive well-planned and systemic approaches that address the multiple climate change risks. While others underscore that there are significant challenges to achieving transformational adaptation which are linked to insufficient mitigation ambition and action and the fact that there are hard and soft limits to adaptation. According to one submission, the GGA work programme should reflect on which transformative action pathways lead to potentially maladaptive as well as climate-resilient futures and provide guidance in making decisions about what and how to transform, who benefits and who bears the burdens of transformation, now and in the future.

19. According to several Parties, any implementation under the Paris Agreement should be done in accordance with the principles of the UNFCCC and the Paris Agreement, and in particular the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities, and should consider the specific needs and different national circumstances of developing country Parties. Some Parties also called for considering different levels of development and the need to significantly reduce the socioeconomic global inequities and imbalances between developed and developing countries in light of the Paris Agreement provisions.

B. Understanding of and reviewing progress towards the GGA

20. Many Parties emphasized that the GGA must be global in nature, defined both qualitatively and quantitatively and not designed to fit a certain region or country. While each country has different priorities, they stressed that it is important to clearly define collective global goals and common priorities.

21. Many Parties also looked at the different components of the GGA: vulnerability, resilience, which for some includes economic resilience, social and livelihood resilience, and ecosystem and landscape resilience, adaptation capacity and the links with mitigation and sustainable development. Additional core elements being suggested include support, collective action commensurate with climate risks, capabilities and transformation.

22. In terms of enhancing adaptive capacity, several Parties stressed that this is a moving target due to shifting baselines, impacts and vulnerabilities of countries due to insufficient action to mitigate greenhouse gases emissions. The GGA, according to many, is inextricably linked to the temperature goal, as temperature rise is based on levels of current mitigation actions resulting in different levels of severity of impacts. Achieving the GGA depends not only on adequate and effective adaptation action and support, but also on enhanced mitigation action and further ambition. In addition, several Parties recognized that there are hard and soft limits to adaptation, regardless of the robustness of any goal.

23. Several submissions highlighted additional considerations to be taken into account when defining the GGA, including cascading and compounding effects that exacerbate existing societal inequalities and marginalization in regard to income, gender, education and disability, thus amplifying vulnerabilities and challenging progress towards sustainable development. It is therefore critical that the global goal on adaptation consider the systemic and interconnected nature of risks based on transdisciplinary, cross-scale and cross-sectoral approaches.

24. One submission emphasized that the impacts of climate change are not confined by national borders: they affect and are amplified by trade and supply chains, capital flows, human mobility, and the sharing of natural resources among countries, regionally and globally. Likewise, actions to adapt to climate change can have impacts far beyond the jurisdiction in which they are implemented. Thus, while the consequences of climate change

are felt and addressed at the national and subnational levels, they also require a multilateral response to transboundary risks that current approaches to adaptation rarely provide.

25. Regarding assessing progress on achieving the GGA, many underline that this should be a learning and iterative process and that there is no single – nor any specific set of – metrics or indicators that can appropriately represent the breadth and variety of adaptation efforts across the world.

26. Given the different components, many Parties proposed developing a coherent conceptual framework for understanding and assessing progress towards achieving goals relating to adaptive capacity, vulnerability and resilience of countries in the context of current and future climate change impacts. The framework should be designed to be both flexible and sensitive to national contexts on the one hand, but also scalable and suitable to diverse contexts on the other hand. The framework should also be broad enough to absorb the wide variety of sources and formats of information, rigorous enough to capture data to characterize progress towards the goal, and adaptive enough to accommodate new developments in the field of assessing adaptation as the years go by.

27. As part of such a framework, Parties, according to some, could consider identifying and agreeing on a set of global adaptation targets and associated indicators or dimensions, with appropriate timelines aligned with the NDCs, adaptation communications and reports, and GST cycles, covering all elements of the adaptation cycle from data generation and collection to implementation and support. Identifying the global adaptation targets and nationally appropriate indicators for voluntary use by Parties could follow both a bottom up and top down approach; a bottom-up approach in drawing on adaptation-related goals and targets identified by Parties in their national planning, communication and reporting instruments, and top-down in drawing on adaptation-related targets applied by or identified through relevant multilateral frameworks and bodies.

28. One submission for example suggested a country-driven approach whereby governments set their own goals for adaptation – for example, by 2025–2030 and by 2030–2040 – where the GGA becomes a collation and aggregation of these. In a first iteration, the GGA for 2030 could be a collation of process goals – i.e. plans developed, actions implemented, numbers of people being trained, etc., across a specified number of priority sectors. The GGA could be for 100% of Parties to achieve these goals by 2030. A second iteration of the GGA for the period 2030–2040 could be outcome-focused, and an aggregation of ratcheting of ambition in national goals which, in turn, are based on the use of standardised methods to identify climate risks and adaptation actions – including transboundary adaptation action – and based on a better understanding of process.

29. Synthesizing and analyzing national information across key adaptation dimensions at the global level will ensure that progress is being made towards the objectives of the GGA. This exercise should not be mistaken for aggregation of national metrics, but rather as review of various national information and assessments, that can provide a global narrative on adaptation and resilience. The objective is not to measure against baselines or a previous state, but rather to assess progress towards a future goal. There are numerous dimensions that need to be assessed, including – but not limited to – reducing vulnerabilities and risks, short-medium and long term available adaptation options, gaps of suitable adaptation options, availability, and accessibility of means of implementation including finance, capacity-building and technology transfer and efficiency of robust monitoring and evaluation systems.

30. Other Parties cautioned against trying to agree on quantified targets to assess progress towards the GGA and instead propose to focus on how to enhance the implementation of adaptation action and support. Not agreeing on a quantified target for the GGA, according to them, does not hamper the possibility of using quantitative indicators, in combination with qualitative indicators, as part of the review of overall progress made in achieving the GGA.

31. Several Parties concluded that a combination of approaches for assessing progress is needed, and that the international community has not sufficiently explored the relative

strengths and weaknesses of different approaches and their applicability, and therefore their potential synergies in complementing each other.

C. Enhancing implementation and support for adaptation

32. Many Parties called on sharing experiences to identify adaptation options and needs as well as best practices for scalable and replicable adaptation actions, including nature-based solutions, at the local, regional and national levels, with a view to incentivizing and further inspiring adaptation actions around the globe. Some suggested to undertake a stocktake of existing national adaptation goals and activities based on existing national or sectoral strategies, policies and plans, with a view to identifying common priorities; as well as knowledge gaps and needs, untapped options and experience, with a view to recognizing adaptation efforts of developing countries and strengthening national adaptation planning and implementation. This stocktake would also provide a clear picture of how countries and regions have advanced their adaptation efforts, and how internationally agreed adaptation planning objectives have been translated into national actions. In this regard, one submission highlighted the economics of adaptation, whereby decision-makers are required to identify and evaluate cost-efficient adaptation measures, sustainable investment options, and disaster risk financing instruments that can be used to cover residual risk.

33. Many emphasized to engage stakeholders – including from the private sector and civil society – that are already engaged in adaptation planning and implementation but are not generally involved in UNFCCC discussions. Such outside stakeholder engagement could help countries identify sources of expertise, knowledge, and technical and capacity building resources.

34. National Adaptation Plans were highlighted by many Parties as a key element for developing countries to determine their priorities, gaps and needs. They called for adequate and timely support for formulating and implementing NAPs, and for considering insufficiencies that developing countries, in particular least developed countries, are currently experiencing in terms of NAP formulation and implementation, which in turn could inform the 2024 evaluation of NAP progress.

35. Several Parties underlined the need to create an enabling environment for enhancing adaptation action, including through ensuring political commitment, institutional frameworks, knowledge sharing, technology transfer, access to finance, inclusive governance, just transition and integration of adaptation into local, national, and regional planning. Some also highlighted the difficulties in transitioning from adaptation planning to implementing these plans.

36. Many Parties highlighted addressing the adaptation needs of developing countries, especially those that are particularly vulnerable, through adequate means of implementation, including finance, technology development and transfer and capacity-building. Some suggested exploring available financial and technological support for developing countries, including areas which have received such support.

37. Regarding enhancing mobilization of and access to adaptation finance, several Parties underlined that it should primarily be from public and grant based sources and that there should be a balance between mitigation and adaptation. Some proposed to consider effective ways to co-opt multilateral development banks, other international financial institutions and the private sector in the mobilization effort in order to deliver the scale of resources needed to achieve adaptation objectives.

38. Strengthening cooperative action on technology development and transfer, including accelerating, encouraging, and enabling innovation, was highlighted by some as being critical for the implementation of adaptation action. Cooperative action on technology development is strongly tied to capacity-building, specifically skills development and training.

39. Finally, several Parties proposed exploring the assessment of adequacy and effectiveness of adaptation actions and support, i.e. support available and received by developing countries vis-à-vis estimated adaptation needs, as clarity in elaborating the adequacy and effectiveness of efforts and responses will further strengthen the implementation of adaptation actions in vulnerable developing countries.

D. Methodologies, metrics, indicators, and monitoring and evaluation

40. Many Parties emphasized that M&E is a crucial component of the adaptation policy cycle and serves multiple purposes, playing a critical role in adjusting actions to reduce risks as well as supporting wider development goals. In particular, the monitoring of outcomes is critical for tracking the effectiveness and progress of adaptation.

41. The knowledge and information gained can feed back into the adaptation process, ensuring that such learning helps in prioritizing adaptation actions, providing the evidence to improve access to finance, and informing the development and revision of sectoral and national plans. M&E systems according to many play a valuable role in bridging national perspectives of adaptive capacity, vulnerability and resilience to the global level.

42. Several Parties highlighted a need to move from monitoring of progress at the level of projects, to capturing progress at a systemic or national level. One submission pointed to trade-offs between the desire to evaluate and the need to learn from adaptation processes as they unfold, and called for embracing complexity, co-creation with actors, and reflexive learning.

43. Many Parties wished to share good practices and lessons learned in establishing and operating monitoring, evaluation and learning systems with a view to facilitating the establishment of appropriate systems in each country and region. Some Parties referred to the upcoming technical paper by the AC with case studies on the use of M&E systems at national and sub-national levels.

44. Several Parties highlighted that M&E systems are absent or need significant strengthening in developing countries, in particular small island developing States and least developed countries, and that there is significant need for capacity-building to develop robust M&E systems which capture both qualitative and quantitative data and information on adaptation action. Recognizing the complexity and the many constraints existing to applying M&E systems, this part of the work programme could serve to better understand these, which will be of great value to Parties as well as non-Party stakeholders.

45. Some pointed out that where systems are being conceptualized/developed, they tend to focus on process indicators rather than providing insights into the changing states of vulnerability and resilience and called for further work in relation to metrics and methodologies, with a view to fully assessing and evaluating vulnerability, resilience and adaptive capacity.

46. According to many Parties, metrics and indicators need to be flexible and adaptive to aggregate both the quantitative and qualitative information of adaptation, and to bridge data at different levels. Some call for defining or identifying metrics that translate the relevant resilience goals (or Sustainable Development Goals) into quantifiable variables. Examples given include metrics related to the protection of life, reduction in economic losses, distribution of flood risk across socioeconomic groups, protection of community lifelines and strategic assets, persistence of coastal ecosystems, diversity of habitats, maintaining economic drivers, supporting traditional fishing and agriculture communities, and protecting historic and tribally significant cultural resources. Others underlined the importance of adaptation actions and progress, ultimately resulting in improved wellbeing of individuals, communities and societies at risk, both now and in the future, and that such actions do not shift vulnerability and hazard exposure onto others while at the same time enhancing climate mitigation.

47. Several Parties argued that adaptation metrics be robust enough to include the understanding of local conditions, taking into account local vulnerabilities and hazard exposure and be measurable in a straightforward manner that does not add onerous reporting but links into existing reporting and enables learning. Some suggested choosing a range of metrics that all Parties can move towards reporting on over time, supported by a framework for integrating metrics at different scales.

48. Finally, many Parties suggested drawing information from relevant pre-existing indicators and data sets, including those developed in the context of the Sustainable Development Goals and the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction. Further technical work was suggested to assess the relevance of these indicators, noting the different purposes of these international frameworks.

E. Communication and reporting

49. Many submissions highlighted that reporting instruments such as the Adaptation Communications, Biennial Transparency Reports (BTRs) coming into effect in 2024, National Adaptation Plans (NAPs), Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs), and National Communications should be the main instruments to convey information on countries' adaptation priorities, needs, plans and progress and to inform progress towards achieving the GGA, including in the context of the GST.

50. One submission suggested that the GGA work programme could facilitate early submission of Adaptation Communications by sharing good practice and demonstrating the advantages of Adaptation Communications.

51. Some also emphasized that building coherence and strengthening consistency across the different reporting vehicles is important in building a more integrated, coherent and streamlined approach to communicating and reporting on adaptation action, support and progress. In this regard, the upcoming supplementary guidelines by the AC on Adaptation Communications are expected to help bridge inconsistencies across the different vehicles, and some suggested for the AC to present their guidelines to the work programme. The work programme could also help identify best practices in reporting adaptation goals, planning, implementation, challenges, and needs with a view to strengthening the adaptation section of the upcoming BTRs and improved linkages with the Adaptation Communications.

52. At the same time, submissions also underlined that the reporting burden in developing countries, especially those that are capacity-constrained, should be minimized. Synchronizing and harmonizing the various reporting instruments was suggested to avoid duplication of effort and to reduce reporting burden.

53. According to one submission, the work programme could also explore the full breadth of communication tools, both within and outside the UNFCCC as well as how reporting instruments from governments can better include and represent all voices in a society, including from civil society.

54. Others also suggested to widely disseminate existing templates and guidance documents to the Parties to encourage the preparation of Adaptation Communications, and for the work programme to focus on how countries can utilize their Adaptation Communications to articulate their priorities to different audiences, including to contribute to a more comprehensive picture of adaptation priorities and progress at the global level and showcase innovative approaches to adaptation challenges.

IV. Views on the operational design of the GGA work programme

A. Clustering and sequencing the consideration of the objectives

55. Most Parties recognized that the objectives of the GGA work programme are not mutually exclusive and are indeed overlapping. Many Parties see objective (a) “enabling the full and sustained implementation of the Paris Agreement, towards achieving the global goal on adaptation, with a view to enhancing adaptation action and support” as an overarching objective to guide the workshops throughout the two-year work programme.

56. Many Parties have put forward proposed clusters of the objectives and the sequence in which they would like to see them being addressed to ensure a logical flow to adequately address the GGA. The most frequent clusters put forward relate to:

- (a) Enhancing understanding of the global goal on adaptation and of reviewing overall progress towards it (objectives b and c);
- (b) Enhancing adaptation action and support (objectives d and g);
- (c) Methodologies, indicators, data and metrics, monitoring and evaluation (objectives b and f);
- (d) Communicating and reporting on adaptation priorities (objectives e and h).

57. Accordingly, the themes for the four workshops in 2022 could be the following:

(a) The first workshop during SB 56 to focus on enhancing understanding of the global goal on adaptation and of reviewing overall progress towards it. The workshop is expected to explore the goal-setting entry point: the different levels of adaptation or targets to which countries and communities aspire, and how to assess or measure progress towards them. The workshop will also consider the underlying complexities in setting targets and measuring progress, including as they relate to trade-offs, uncertainties, linkages and principles;⁶

(b) The second workshop could focus on enhancing adaptation action and support, including sharing of experiences and lessons learned, gaps and needs, scaling up actions and support, recognizing adaptation efforts and looking at adequacy and effectiveness of action and support with a special emphasis on vulnerable developing countries;

(c) The third workshop could consider methodologies, indicators, data and metrics, monitoring and evaluation with a view to providing insights for reviewing adaptation progress at national and global level;

(d) Finally, the fourth workshop could look at communicating and reporting on adaptation priorities, including considering complementarities of the various communication and reporting tools and taking into account insights from the first three workshops consider inputs to the GST.

58. Many Parties underlined that the workshops in 2022 should inform the first GST. In terms of the workshops in 2023, several Parties suggested to take stock of the implementation of the GGA work programme at COP 27/CMA 4 and then consider themes for the workshops in 2023, whereas other suggested to focus the 2023 workshops on monitoring and evaluation (M&E), communicating and reporting, specific elements concerning adaptation action and support or even high-priority sectors.

⁶ A detailed concept note with guiding questions is available at https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/CN_GGA_WS1_27May22.pdf.

59. Some Parties expressed a desire to already have a substantive outcome at COP 27/CMA 4, in particular on enhancing understanding of the GGA as well as reviewing and assessing progress towards it with a view to providing guidance to the GST.

B. Organizational considerations in the conduct of the workshops

60. Many Parties emphasized that the workshops should be designed to be dynamic, transparent and that they should allow for inclusive participation, mutual learning and constructive exchanges and discussions, with a view to achieving the objectives of the work programme. Many called for ensuring an equitable geographical representation of Parties and non-Party stakeholders, including experts, practitioners, sector agencies and actors, as well as representatives from civil society, including local communities and indigenous peoples, youth and people with disabilities, the private sector, multilateral development banks, international financial institutions, civil society organizations and academia, to participate in the work programme in order to ensure inclusivity.

61. One Party proposed that the workshops be designed in such a way that takes into account the impact of adaptation activities and decisions on the rights, knowledge systems, practices, and ways of life of indigenous peoples.

62. According to many Parties, work carried out under the work programme should be based on and informed by the best available science, including the latest IPCC reports.

63. The work programme should also seek synergies and leverage the expertise of existing bodies and processes under and outside of the UNFCCC process, including the IPCC, the Adaptation Committee (AC), the Least Developed Countries Expert Group (LEG) and other relevant constituted bodies under the Convention and the Paris Agreement as well as the Nairobi work programme.

64. As proposed by many Parties, the workshops should strike a balance between presentations, information dissemination, deliberations and exchange of views to facilitate a space for enhanced understanding and learning. Innovative formats and tools for the workshops should also be applied to facilitate meaningful and active engagement of all participants. It was suggested that the SB Chairs, with the support of the Secretariat, prepare and publish ahead of each workshop a set of open, non-prescriptive guiding questions on which participants could draw in the discussions. Any material from the workshops should be made available on a dedicated webpage.⁷

65. In terms of the in-person workshops in conjunction with the SB sessions, several Parties suggested for them to take place in-session in order to maximize participation and avoid conflicts with pre-session coordination meetings. Shorter workshop sessions spread out over several days were also suggested to allow Parties sufficient time and space to adequately reflect on all matters discussed, while avoiding overlaps in scheduling the workshops with relevant adaptation negotiating agenda items and mandated events. Some proposed to hold the in-session workshops in a hybrid format to enhance participation.

66. In terms of the intersessional virtual workshops, several Parties highlighted that the virtual modality will allow for broad participation of Parties and non-Party stakeholders, and that short sessions should be stretched over multiple days. Others pointed to the inevitable challenges to be faced by virtual arrangements, including internet connectivity, technological and technical availability and differences in time zones, which could lead to inequalities in Parties' level of participation and engagement. In addition, some Parties emphasized that the quality of virtual discussions among many participants and the short time slots allocated for discussions compromise meaningful progress, and called on the SB Chairs to clarify what arrangements will be put in place to ensure the equitable and effective participation of Parties and ensure that all views are expressed and captured.

⁷ <https://unfccc.int/topics/adaptation-and-resilience/workstreams/glasgow-sharm-el-sheikh-WP-GGGA>.

67. Finally, some Parties saw a need to assess the possibilities and feasibility to transform the virtual workshops into in-person ones, and called on developed country Parties and other Parties to come forward with offers to support hosting in-person workshops, including in hybrid mode.

C. Ensuring complementarity with ongoing work and processes and possible additional activities

68. Several Parties underlined that workshops under the GGA work programme should leverage, raise awareness about and utilise the rich existing work already done or underway on adaptation, including by the numerous bodies and arrangements that serve the Convention and the Paris Agreement such as the AC or the LEG.

69. According to some Parties, the GGA work programme should not create parallel or duplicative processes but align its work with other ongoing adaptation related processes. For example, discussions under the work programme could consider how to better utilize, and where necessary update or repurpose, existing tools, resources and mechanisms. The GGA work programme could also identify where new efforts or tools may add value – including scientific research, technical papers, and policy-oriented knowledge products – and how the existing institutional arrangements on adaptation can help develop or facilitate such work.

70. Such further work may include a mapping of different adaptation related indicators and criteria used or put in place by relevant regional and multilateral bodies, and those included in Parties' planning, communication and reporting instruments or an update of the 1994 IPCC Technical Guidelines for Assessing Climate Change Impacts and Adaptations.⁸

71. Some Parties suggested to encourage closer coordination between the present and incoming COP Presidencies, presiding officers, and relevant constituted bodies on how to advance the different mandates on adaptation given the interlinkages and importance of their work.

72. Others suggested that informal discussions and webinars be convened in between formal workshops with a view to creating more spaces for Parties and non-Party stakeholders to exchange and learn. In addition, some encouraged the COP Presidencies to continue to organize dedicated sessions of the informal meetings of heads of delegation on adaptation, and to use them to take stock of progress on the work programme and encourage Parties to enhance their ambition and adaptation support and actions.

73. Finally, one Party proposed to consult sectoral agencies and actors through local roundtables, seminars and debates on what constitutes sectoral adaptation goals.

D. Capturing outcomes

74. Some Parties emphasized that the mandated single annual report be balanced and comprehensive, reflecting all views and suggestions expressed in the workshops. According to them, the report should not contain any recommendations or conclusions as it would be up to Parties to reflect on the outcomes of the workshops and determine any next steps, as appropriate.

75. In addition, some Parties proposed that progress of each workshop be captured as an informal or SB Chairs' note to help advance discussions in subsequent workshops and inform the deliberations under the SBs, including the SBs annual report to the CMA.

⁸ <https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/2018/03/ipcc-technical-guidelines-1994n-1.pdf>.